

E 458

.2

.S82

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00006148451









act of God, or Divine act not done through the agency of second causes, or concreative act of creatures, is a supernatural act, and gives birth to a supernatural order,—not disconnected or essentially different from the natural order, indeed, but in reality related to it, and harmonizing dialectically with it. Supposing God intended when resolving to extrinsicate his creative Word to give it the highest possible expression, and to complete his creative act, by raising the finite to infinite power, the creature to oneness with the Creator, the supernatural is not an afterthought in his creation, but integral in his original plan, and the natural and supernatural are but parts of one indissoluble whole, and differ from each other only as the initial or inchoate differs from the completion or fulfilment. It is well for those who are in the habit of supposing that the natural and supernatural, nature and grace, stand opposed one to the other to bear this in mind; for they are opposed only as the initial is opposed to completion or fulfilment.

Taking the view of catholic truth as thus far presented, we find the Trinity, or the eternal and immanent generation of the Word and the procession of the Holy Ghost, which we must assert, if we assert at all God as actual living being, or being in its plenitude. God expresses his intelligence in himself, and generates the Word, the express image of himself, and the same in essence with himself. "The Word was with God and the Word was God"—"the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his substance." The Son turns to the Father, and the Father to the Son, and from their mutual spiration, the Father as principle, the Son as medium, proceeds Love or the Holy Ghost, the complement or perfection of the immanent progression of the Divine Being. God chooses to express himself externally, and thus creates the universe, which is himself extrinsicated, for it must express his Word or not be any expression of him at all. It expresses his essence externally in time and space, as the Word expresses it internally, in his own bosom, to himself. He chooses, as we learn from revelation, not only to redeem man from the Fall, but to carry in man his creative act to its apex, to complete the Divine Being in the extrinsic or participated order, and thus incarnates himself in man, and raises the creature to union with himself, making the finite one with the infinite, the created one with the Creator; that is to say, God *mediante* the creative act. The type copied is in

In page ~~144~~ 97 & 111

his own essence, the Father concurring as principle, the Son as medium, and the Holy Ghost as end. So that by the return of the creation in man to God, which is in the second cycle and responds externally to the procession of the Holy Ghost internally, the participated being is completely actualized, perfected, and God is all and in all, externally and internally.

Here as to the principle, medium, and end is catholic truth, that is, universal truth, one and catholic, for it embraces at once in the real order, and in dialectic harmony, both God and the universe; God in his interior essence and in his exterior manifestation or expression. But we have seen that there is in God a progression, immanent indeed, eternal, with its term in his essence itself. This progression has its expression in the external universe, or in the extrinsicication of the creative act, and this progression in the external cannot be immanent and complete instantaneously, as it were, but is in time and space, the chronotope, and therefore is successive. It, however, copies the Divine idea, and follows its type. It must, then, not only develop in time and space, the external expression of the internal chronotope, or ideal time and space, that is, the ability of God to extrinsicicate his creative act, but it must have its own interior and exterior expression, for the universe as a whole and in all its parts, represents the Divine idea, and copies the progression of the interior essence of God. Each creature is, in its order, God in miniature, or the created God representing the eternal, uncreated, living, and self-sufficing God, in its own order and from its own point of view. The extrinsicication of the Word or creative act is the created universe. The completion or fulfilment of this extrinsicication is the Incarnation, or the creature become God. The extrinsicication of man become God, or of the Word made flesh, that is, of the Theandric Word, is the Church; bearing as to the Word Incarnate, first, the relation which the universe bears to the internal, by whom all things were made; and second, the relation analogous to that which the human race, in the order of genesis, bears to Adam, its progenitor, as has been time and again explained in these pages. The Incarnation being in time the Theandric Word is the Word extrinsicicated, and therefore must follow the law of the chronotope, and the progression of its life must be progressive, not in eternity only, but in time, and therefore be the successive explication of the Theandric Idea. But this suc-

cessive explication and realization in time would be impossible without its extrinsic expression. Hence the necessity of the external Church as well as the internal. The Church is the Theandric universe, or universe successively returning to union with God, or in the participated sense, becoming God, attaining to its end or consummation, which is its transfiguration in God or glorification.

The universe is the extrinsic explication of the mystery of the Divine essence, and as such must have in time a progression responding to the immanent and eternal progression asserted by the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, in that essence itself. But in the extrinsic, that is, in the chronotope, the explication is successive, and the progression is from a principle, by a medium, to an end or term not identical with itself. Hence the creature does not attain the term of its existence at once, in the very instant of its creation, but is created *in potentia* to its end. Hence God creates all creatures in genera and species, creates kinds, which are each, according to its own law, successively developed. This order of successive development is the order of generation, having its origin and archetype in the generation of the Word, whence the relations of paternity and filiation. The genera and species do not subsist without individuals, any more than individuals subsist without genera and species. There is no humanity separate from the individual man, and no individual man without humanity,—*humanitas*. Adam was a perfect man in the order of genesis or generation, for in him both the race and the individual were coincident. He was created as the race individuated, and though all individual men as individuals were in him only *in potentia*, in him was the entire human race, and therefore potentially all individuals. The successive individuation of the race, through successive births, is only the explication in the actual order of what was virtual in him. Hence we can understand why his fall, or the degeneracy of the race in him, affects all his posterity, or how it is that all men sinned in him; for all were in him as the race, and it is only as the race that original sin is asserted of Adam's posterity.

The Theandric Word, or Christ, is at once the Theandric Individual, and the Theandric race. The Word assumed human nature individuated, completed in the individual assumed, not, however, an individual isolated from the race, but an individual in whom the race subsisted. He was the

second Adam, the Theandric Adam, and the progenitor of the whole Theandric race. All who pertain to the Regeneration are virtual in him, as all pertaining to the order of generation were virtual in Adam. Hence his power to expiate or atone for their sins, and their ability to share in his merits. They suffered and bore the penalty of their sins in him, because they were in him, and for the same reason they share his merits, and enter into his glory. They were in him, as included in the Theandric race; and when actually regenerated by grace, or are born into the palingenesia, actually individuated in the order of regeneration, they are in him individually, or one with him, according to his prayer to his Father, "Let them be one as we are one."

But if all the elect are virtually in Christ as the second Adam, their individuation in him, or the explication of the potentiality of the Theandric race, as in the first Adam, is progressive, successive in time, and therefore must follow the law of all progression, and have its principle, medium, and end. The principle is grace, for we are born of Christ by grace, not by natural generation; the medium is the Sacrament or Sacraments, the end is the Holy Ghost, or Love, the complete union with God. But as the prototype is always in the Divine essence, and the archetype in the Divine progression or explication of his Word, the progression must be an extrinsic as well as an intrinsic progress, and have its extrinsic as well as its intrinsic medium. Hence the Church must be external as well as internal, and express externally as well as internally the Theandric life or progression, as the body is the outward expression of the man. The external is the extrinsic expression of the internal, and therefore must copy or imitate it as its idea or model. Now, as God is one, and in creating expresses one Divine Word, giving origin to one universe, as the Word made flesh is one, giving origin to one Theandric race, and as the internal Church is one, being the Word made flesh, so must the external Church, which expresses the internal, be one. As the internal is catholic, since it is the Word made flesh, the indissoluble union of Divinity and humanity, and therefore including all truth and all reality, for man is the *resumé* of all created orders, and all creation in his return to God attains to its end, the external Church must be one and catholic, potentially catholic in time and space, and actually in the Idea, or the Ideal truth it ex-

presses. As there is but one God, as there is but one cosmos, but one Word made flesh, but one Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, there can be but one faith, one baptism, and but one Church, either externally or internally.*

If there be any truth in what we have thus far advanced, there is in the Divine Being his own reason of being, and the law, not the necessity, of all external creation. He could not have expressed his Word extrinsically, without creating an external universe, nor could he have made that universe an extrinication, so to speak, of Himself, without adding to generation regeneration, to the generation of the Word the procession of the Holy Ghost. Without its return to God in the Holy Ghost, through the medium of the Word, the progression would have been initial, incomplete, and no image, even in the external order, of his infinite, immanent, eternally consummated progression. This return could not have been effected without the second act, or Incarnation of the Word; for without that act, you would have had generation, but no regeneration, and no procession in the extrinsic order of the Holy Ghost, and consequently no consummation, no sanctification, no glorification, consequently no beatitude.

It may be said that God might have made the return of the creature instantaneous with its birth, or the palingenesiac cycle consentaneous with the cosmic, leaving no interval of time between them; but to have so done would have destroyed the liberty of second causes. If he created man after his own image and likeness, he must create him with moral freedom, and leave his return to God to the freedom of his own choice. He must, in such case, have made a universe which would by no means express his own freedom in the act of creation, or express in time his own progression: for the external expression of the progression of the Divine being is and must be a progression in time,—not a progression without any term indeed, as our modern progressists assert, which is the most lively image of hell we are able to conceive, but a progression whose term is the infinite. Progress forever going on, and never reaching its term, is the greatest of all sophisms; is, in fact, the hell of the reprobate. It does not imply that man is infinitely progressive, but that he is not progressive at all,—

* We refer, for a further exposition of this point, to what we have said in the Review for January last, p. 19, *et seq.*

that he remains forever seeking and never finding. Infinite progress is progress to the infinite, and finds its term in the infinite, which is heaven, glorification; for then the finite is glorified in its union with the infinite. Progression in God is immanent progression, and excludes all idea of succession, or of time. But progression in creature involves, necessarily, the idea of the Chronotope, and is inconceivable without an interval, longer or shorter, between the beginning and the end.

Besides, if we suppose genesis and palingenesia coincident and consentaneous, we resolve progression in the extrinsic order into the intrinsic and Divine immanent progression, and take away all concreative act of creatures, and the end is attained to by the immediate supernatural act of God, without the co-operation of creatures. Creatures then cease to be second causes, or to be in any sense concreative, that is, creative by the aid of the Divine *con-cursus*. This would deny the Divine image in his works, deny that he creates after the idea or type eternal in his own essence, and would make him the only actor in the universe, which would place us on the declivity to pantheism.

Yet the objection implied amounts to nothing. God expressing himself extrinsically expresses himself under the relation of time and space, and his expression in regard to creatures leaves, necessarily a potentiality to be reduced to act, genera to be specificated, and species to be individuated, the initial or inchoate to be finished, fulfilled; but in regard to himself his act is eternally complete, and there is no interval between its commencement and its end. For him there is no past, no future, but "one eternal now." All in his mind, as in his decree, is present, is fulfilled. The interval is in relation to us, and it is we, and we only to whom moments succeed, because, being finite, we can attain to the infinite only successively, by a succession of acts. Man is not in his origin God, but a God—by participation—that begins. The potentiality of Adam is only successively actualized, and only by successive births and generations is the race complete in him individuated. The individuation is completed in the new-born infant, but the capabilities of the individual are not all developed and actualized by the Divine creative act, without his own concreative act, or series of acts. So with the Christian. All the elect, all the predestinated were really, from the first

instant of the Incarnation, in Christ, as you and I were in Adam, when God created him in his own image and likeness, and created him with the male and female principle,—“male and female created he them”—as much as we were when he separated the female principle from the male, and formed woman from the side of Adam, “bone of his bone, flesh of his flesh;” but as individuals we are virtual, not actual in him, till begotten anew by grace, and regenerated or born again. Time and space pertain to the potential, and mark the process of its reduction to act; and as this reduction is only by the co-operation or concreative act of the creature, it must be in relation to the creature successive, in time, though in regard to God it is simultaneous. Consequently, whether it is done a day earlier or a day later, as we say, if so be space is left for the free election and co-operation of the creature, it in no way affects the reason or truth of things.

If we are right as to the principles of Catholic theology we have briefly and inadequately stated, our position must be conceded that the proper point of view for studying the great Movement in the sixteenth century, as any other great world movement, is that of Catholic theology, for that theology is really catholic, universal, embracing all the truth of God and the universe. It places the student at the point of view of God himself, the point of view of the Divine Word or Logos, by whom all things are made, and of which the universe is the extrinsic expression. From this point of view we may appreciate it as truly and as fully as fallible men may appreciate any thing.

We will say, in conclusion, that what we have thus far said, must not be taken as a full and complete treatise on the great Mysteries touched upon, or as containing a solution of all the questions that may be asked in relation to the Trinity, the Incarnation, Creation, or the Church. We have left many gaps, some of which, the reader, if good-natured, may fill up from what we have heretofore published in these pages on the same topics, and others will be filled up as we proceed with the Essays to which this must be regarded as a theological and philosophical introduction. Our design is, if we are spared the sufficient use of our eyes, to furnish our readers with a series of articles intended to present a thorough theological, philosophical, and historical appreciation of the great Protestant Movement, and, in principle, of all heterodox movements in ancient or modern

times. We may move slowly, and not unlikely disappear before completing our task. But we shall do what we can.

In what we have said, we have laid down the principles we shall develop and apply as we proceed. The appositeness of some of our remarks will not be seen till we advance, and till then many things will appear to be too indistinctly stated, and to be left unsupported, or to be assumed without sufficient reason. We could not help it, unless we had expanded our Introduction into a whole course of theology, and made it longer than the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas. Nevertheless, perhaps, taking what we have said by itself, independently of what is to follow, it may not be worthless. It may lead some minds to a better understanding of the dialectic character of the Divine Essence and creative act, and to trace the relations of the created universe back to their prototype in the triple relation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, eternal and immanent in the Divine Essence. We have wished, as far as our limits would permit, to show that the universe, internally and externally, is the extrinsication of the Divine essence, and its procession from God in the cosmos, and return to God in the palingenesia, is an external manifestation and realization of what is essential, eternal, and immanent in the Divine Being,—God producing exteriorly a created God, responding to himself, and in its consummation to be united to him, as the human nature is united to the Divine in the Incarnation of the Word.

We do not suppose that we have said any thing to which the eminent prelate, whose History of the Reformation we have referred to, for he is a Catholic prelate, and far more learned in Catholic theology than we are, would object. We venerate his character, and have heretofore prized, and should still prize, were he not disposed to withhold it, his private friendship. All we permit ourselves to say is, that in our judgment he does not write his history from the really Catholic point of view, and, though he is orthodox as to dogma, he is sectarian, partisan, in spirit and tone. Also, that he fails to penetrate the external fact, and to seize its methexic sense. We think there is more in the Movement than he sees, that it has a deeper and a less unchristian sense than he detects, or than we ourselves had detected in our earlier essays on the subject.

All our readers know that we regard the Protestant Movement as heterodox, and heterodoxy as always in itself

hurtful to men and society. We are Catholic, not Protestant; but we wish, if possible, not merely to show the sophistical side of the so-called Reformation, but also its dialectic side. We wish to show its truth and its error, its good and its bad, and to fix its real character in relation to the evolution of truth and the progress of civilization. This done in a calm and catholic tone, with a spirit of justice, and with a tolerable comprehension of the Movement as a world movement, can justly offend no Protestant, and need give umbrage to no Catholic. Catholicity embraces and integrates in itself all truth, wherever it discovers it, for all truth is hers. She is strong enough in herself to be always just, always impartial, always sedate, without prejudice, without passion, without fear. We can never hope to recall the heterodox to Catholic unity till we can gain from them a hearing—and a hearing from them we cannot gain till we learn to treat their understandings with respect, and their characters with justice.

No man worthy of the name ever consents to compromise his principles for any end whatever, for no good ever comes of a lie. An uncompromising Catholic is simply a Catholic, nothing more, nothing less. We make no compromise with heterodoxy when we recognize in the heterodox some elements of truth, and commend in them what is worthy of commendation. There is neither wisdom nor justice in endeavoring to keep our own people orthodox by painting the heterodox blacker than they are. Falsehood, deception, even for a good end, though too often practised, is never allowable. All deception, every lie is a sophism, and a sin against the dialectic order of things, and against God, in whose essence is the prototype of all dialectics. "The first of all gospels," says Thomas Carlyle, "is that a lie is a lie, and no lie shall live." No casuistry can explain away the sophistical character of falsehood, or make deception harmless. We have no right to practise what are called "pious frauds." Catholicity is real, truthful, honest, straightforward, and can tolerate no sham, make-believe, or humbug. All such things are sophistical and heterodox. Besides, such things are bad even as a policy. Let us bring up our children to believe that Protestants have nothing but falsehood in their doctrines, and wickedness in their practice, and the first decent Protestant they meet will convince them of our own want of truth and honesty. In many things very commendable, and very important in the progress of civilization, there are

Protestants who are superior to not a few Catholics. The old safeguard system no longer serves any good purpose. We must protect our children from error by teaching them the truth, and being always truthful in all our relations with them and with others.

-
- ART. III.—1. *The War: a Slave Union or a Free?* Speech of Hon. MARTIN F. CONWAY, of Kansas, delivered in the House of Representatives. Thursday, December 12th, 1861. Revised by the Author.
2. *The Power and Duty of Congress to provide for the common Defence and the Suppression of the Rebellion.* Speech of Hon. JNO. A. BINGHAM, of Ohio, in the House of Representatives, January 15th, 1862.

Our highly esteemed friend of the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, the ablest and most loyal Catholic journal at this time published in our country, takes care to tell us that in his judgment, it is unwise to agitate the slavery question, and that in the present crisis of our national affairs only harm can come of discussing it. He will pardon us, we hope, if we tell him, in return, that we think it both wise and useful for every man who loves his country to agitate that question, and thoroughly discuss it. Slavery has produced our present national crisis. The rebellion itself is, at bottom, only the armed phase of the slavery question, and to suppose it possible to suppress and extinguish it without touching the question, would be like attempting to cure a man of drunkenness without touching the question of temperance. Slavery is now the question, the great question, the whole question before the American people, and it depends on the disposition we make of that question whether we are or are not to continue to be a nation. We cannot blink it, if we would. It enters vitally into the struggle of the nation for life, and we must dispose of it, so that it can never again come up, or all our efforts will be idle, and all our sacrifices of men and money will be worse than lost.

The Southern Confederacy, against which the United States are now hurling their armed forces, rests on slavery as its corner-stone, and derives from it the very reason of its existence. Grant, if you insist upon it, that the sole object of

that illegal and dangerous Confederacy is not the preservation or extension of slavery, still the objects of that Confederacy, the ends for which it has been formed, demand the continuance of slavery. The preservation and extension of slavery may not be the end the rebels have in view, but slavery is the indispensable means to that end. They would not seek to form a separate and independent republic, if it were to be a republic based on the Free Labor System, for they are not such fools as not to know that such a republic would have fewer advantages than the present United States—could never be so strong, never command so high a place in the world's estimation or in the world's history. The whole is and always must be greater than a part, and a man of real ambition would always say, with the old Athenian, "I would rather be second in Athens, than first in Eubœa." Even supposing, then, that the rebels had not originally, or that they have abandoned the intention of reconstructing the whole Union on the basis of the Slave Labor System, they must still preserve that system as the necessary condition of the separate existence, and of the greatness and power they hope to attain to as an independent people. The abolition of slavery would take away all motive, all reason, and all desire for a separation from the Union. Being unable without slavery to attain to the objects they contemplate as a separate and independent political existence, they would naturally desire to remain in the United States, and share the greatness and glory of one united republic.

The productions on which the seceded States rely as the means of securing to them the hegemony of the commercial nations of the world they aspire to, they believe, demand the system of slave labor. "The only reason for desiring slavery," said to us an eminent physician of Charleston, South Carolina, and himself the owner of a hundred slaves, "is that in the management of large plantations the planter must be able to command labor when he wants it, and to be always able to do this, he must own it. Aside from this consideration, slave labor is less economical than free labor. Its advantage over hired labor, or your Northern system of labor, is in the fact that the planter can command it at the very moment he needs it. If he depends on hired labor, he is likely to find his hands striking at the critical moment, and compelling him either to lose the proper time for planting or for gathering his crops and preparing them for market, or to pay them wages that would swallow up all his

profits, and end in his ruin. What is said about the inability of the white man to perform the labor now performed by negroes is worthy of no attention. There is no climate, there is no position in which you can place the negro and the white man side by side in which the white man will not kill the negro. Negroes are preferred, not because they are hardier or more enduring than white laborers, even in our climate; but because they can be kept in slavery, and men of the white race cannot. I know no other argument for negro slavery." Now, as the rebels rely principally on their plantations, on growing and exporting cotton, rice, and tobacco, for their greatness and prosperity, it is clear that, in their view at least, slavery is essential to the end they have in view. Free the negroes, and they are deprived of the means to the end for which they have rebelled, and have formed their Confederacy.

It is, we suppose, the object of the United States in the present civil war to break up the Southern Confederacy, to put down, and utterly extinguish the present rebellion, and, as far as human foresight and human ability can go, to guard against any like rebellion in future. The aim of every nation should be, first of all, self-preservation, or the maintenance of its own existence and the integrity of its territory. Our nation can do this only by rendering universal either the Slave System or the Free Labor System, legalizing slavery everywhere in the land, or permitting it nowhere. Were we to beat, as we are beating, the armies of the Confederacy, and crush its present military power, we should so long as slavery occupied its former position, at best gain only a truce for some few years, no solid or durable peace. The embers of the rebellion would still slumber, ready to break out and burn afresh on the first opportunity. The slaveholding interest might consent again to govern and use the Union for its own ends, but it would not be extinguished, and would break out in a still more formidable rebellion, and again convulse the nation, the moment that the interest of free labor should show itself able and determined to assert its own rights and legitimacy.

It is useless to multiply words about it. There can be no permanent union of freedom with slavery, no national unity and integrity with slavery in one half of the States and freedom in the other. We have tried the experiment for the best part of a century, and it has failed, utterly failed. Freedom has made all conceivable sacrifices to

slavery. Compromise after compromise has been consented to. We have suppressed the utterance of our noblest convictions, done all that we could to stifle the irrepressible instincts of humanity, lest by some word or deed we might endanger the safety of the Union, and the result has been contempt on the part of the South for the Union-saving North, and the present rebellion. A new trial of the experiment can succeed no better, for the people of the loyal States, if they would retain the slightest approach to self-respect, cannot possibly make greater concessions, or do more than they have already done to render practicable and permanent that union. The experiment has failed, as fail it always will and always must. It is not constitutional government, it is not republicanism, as some of our European friends pretend, that has failed; but the attempted union of freedom and slavery, of two essentially hostile and mutually repellent systems in the same State.

We cannot, then, we repeat, blink the question of slavery if we would. It meets us on the very threshold of the controversy in which the nation is now engaged, and they who petition Congress to put down the rebellion and let the negro question alone, and they who imagine that the present rebellion can be suppressed and extinguished without disposing of the slavery question at once and forever, only show, if not their lack of loyalty, that they have thus far comprehended simply nothing of the terrible question which now involves the life or death of the nation. The advertisement of some players, that they would present on the stage on a given evening Shakspeare's *Hamlet*, with the part of the Prince of Denmark left out by particular request, has long been referred to as a capital joke; but the joke is not half so capital as that of those worthy people who in the discussion of our present national affairs leave out, by particular request, the slave question. Why, the slavery question is the whole question, that without which there never would or could have been any question at all. To refuse to agitate the question of slavery is simply to refuse to agitate any question at all really important in the present crisis. The whole question of extinguishing the rebellion, of restoring the unity and integrity of the nation, and of sustaining our national life and securing future glory, turns on the slave question. You may, as we have said, beat the rebel armies; you may gain victories by sea and by land; you may even gain an armistice or a truce; but to suppose that you can

re-establish peace, and be really a nation, unless you go farther, and remove the cause and mainspring of the rebellion is sheer folly, absolute fatuity. The old union of freedom with slavery under one and the same constitutional government has failed. Slavery, not freedom, has broken it, and broken it, we would feign hope, forever. You cannot restore it, if you would, and you should not, if you could. No man is worthy of the name of statesman, who does not assume this as a fixed fact, and take it as his starting-point in all discussions having reference to our present difficulties and their final settlement. The slave interest, treated with the utmost tenderness, and allowed to have its own way in almost every thing from the very origin of the government, has declared its secession from the Union. It has declared its secession and separation final and irrevocable. It is for freedom to take it at its word. For ourselves we accept the declaration, and insist that it shall be final and irrevocable. We never loved that union, but as it had been consented to by the framers of our Constitution, we have always felt it our duty to avoid doing any thing to endanger it. The dissolution has been by no act of ours, and by no act of the United States. It has been effected by the act of slavery itself, and since slavery has seen proper to secede, and to declare that it will have no farther connection with freedom, we are not sorry, and are resolved on our part also, that they shall never again be united, or their union find a place in the Republic.

We have no patience with those politicians, demagogues, and pettifoggers, who labor to restore the old Union of slavery and freedom, who believe, or profess to believe, in the possibility of its restoration, and who try to persuade us that on that union depend the future greatness and glory of the Republic. The slave interest had always the right to secede from the Union, if it chose, and in this sense we recognize the alleged right of secession; for the United States never made slaveholding obligatory on any particular State, or on any of their citizens. The slave interest had always the right, if it chose, to go out of the Union, to cease to be an interest in or of the nation. It had the perfect right of self-destruction. But having gone out of the Union, and ceased to be an interest in the Union, we deny the obligation of the United States to force it back, or even to permit its voluntary return. It has gone out, and we say, let it stay out. But the right of slavery to secede by no means in-

189

volves the right of the slaveholding States themselves to secede. Slavery might secede, but it could not carry with it any portion of the national territory, the national property, or the national population, and as the slave has no rights and no property of his own, it could carry no rights and no property with it. Its secession, therefore, leaves to the United States all the territory previously occupied by it, and the plenary right of sovereignty over that territory and the population occupying it. The secession could only dissolve the union between slavery and freedom, it could not abrogate the rights of freedom. It, by seceding, necessarily left to freedom the whole national territory, none of which could ever rightly again become slave territory. Rightly and legally considered, the question of slavery in the seceding States is not, whether it shall or shall not be abolished, but whether it shall or shall not be re-established. By the act of secession slavery has no longer a legal *status* in what was the territory of the seceding States, and the population held to service are free, because there is now in that territory no law by which they can be so held. What we demand is, not an act of the government abolishing slavery, but a refusal on the part of the United States to allow the success of their arms over the rebels to be used to re-establish it, or to remand to slavery a population made free by the secession of their masters. Here is the position of the slave question to-day,—a position far in advance of its position yesterday.

While the slave interest, or the interest created by slavery, held fast to the unnatural union of slavery and freedom, and was loyal to the Federal authorities, we opposed all efforts for emancipation by the national government, and threw on the Slave States themselves the whole responsibility of the infamous System they sustained. We, as citizens of the non-Slaveholding States, washed our hands of that System, for we had no rights over it, and were responsible neither for its adoption, nor its continuance. The case is now altered. The slave owners by their rebellion have unquestionably forfeited their right under the Federal Constitution to be protected in their slave property, or as to that matter, in any other species of property. If slavery be ever again recognized as legal, therefore, the responsibility will attach not to Slave States only, but to the whole people of the United States, and we of the Free States will become, clearly and decidedly, *particeps criminis*. Here is a very grave consideration for those who insist on letting

the slave question alone. If we of the Free States suffer the negroes in the Seceding States to be remanded to slavery, the crime and the sin will be not the crime and sin of particular States, but of the nation itself, and of the Free States no less than of the Slave States themselves.

Our readers are aware that we have from the outset maintained that the rebel by his rebellion forfeits his right to property, liberty, and even life, and that States by rebellion are dissolved, or cease to have any laws or usages that anybody is bound to respect. We hold with Mr. Sumner in his noble Resolutions, creditable alike to him as a statesman and a lawyer, that the State by rebellion commits suicide, and lapses as a civil and political entity. All laws, customs, or usages depending for their vitality, force, or vigor on the State, are rendered null and void by its secession, and are to be treated as *non avenues*. Slavery exists in any country only by municipal law, in no country by the *jus gentium*. In our political system it exists by the local law, or by the law or usage of a particular State, in distinction from a law or usage of the United States. Even Chief-Justice Taney in his opinion in the Dred Scott case, does not pretend that slavery exists by virtue of the law of the United States, though he maintains that it has the right to exist wherever it is not forbidden by local law, assuming, as it would seem, that it exists by virtue of the law of nature. But as his opinion was a mere *obiter dictum*, we venture to maintain with a previous opinion of the Supreme Court, with the decisions of the English Courts, with the general principles of law, and with common sense, that slavery being a violation of man's natural liberty, can exist only by virtue of municipal law, and in our country only by the law or usage of a particular State. Consequently it lapses when the State itself lapses. The State by the act of rebellion lapses, and consequently the rebellion of the State abrogates the only law by which negroes are held to service, either to persons loyal or to persons disloyal to the Federal government; for the Federal government never guarantied to any man property in slaves after it had ceased to be property by State law. Any State may abolish slavery within its limits. Should a loyal State even see proper to emancipate its slaves without any indemnification to the owners, the owners have no claim of indemnity against the United States. Their remedy would be only against their own State.

Rev. A. A. Brownson

1862.]

State Rebellion, State Suicide.

201

That a State in its State capacity can under our system, rebel, admits of no doubt, if we concede it to be, though in a subordinate sphere, a civil and political entity, or a civil and political person. It is if a person capable of State action, and when as a State it resists the legitimate authority of the General government, and arms its citizens against it, it rebels. If we deny the autonomy of the State, deny that it is a civil and political person, that is, in the sense a corporation is called a person, we eliminate the federal element of our political system, and make our Republic not a federal, but a consolidated or centralized republic. If we take this ground, slavery nowhere on our territory has any legal existence, for it is evident there is no law of the National government authorizing it. Taking the other ground, a State can rebel, and its rebellion is and must be its dissolution as a State. It ceases from the moment of its rebellion to have any legal existence. Consequently all that depends on its existence for vitality ceases to live, and nothing lives except the natural law, and the Constitution and laws of the United States; but as no one has under either of them any title to slaves, slavery necessarily lapses with the State authorizing it.

That this doctrine reaches far we do not deny, we maintain that under our system a State may rebel, and that the rebellion of a State, *ipso facto*, dissolves it as civil and political society, and consequently vacates all rights and remedies created or afforded by it. There remains after its rebellion no State law in force. Its rebellion vacates all titles held under it, dissolves all contracts, and annihilates all property created by it, and takes away all civil protection for even natural rights, save so far as that protection is given by the Federal government. It abrogates all civil laws respecting marriage, all the laws authorizing the transferring, devising, transmitting, or inheriting property, for these under our system are all left to the State government. The courts of law are all dissolved, and the remedies afforded by them can no longer be enforced. The rebellion, in a word, kills the whole State, and every thing dependent on it. Whether the State be revived and permitted to return to the Union depends entirely on the good pleasure of the Federal authority. It cannot be claimed as a right by the population on the territory of the defunct State. As they could not take the territory out of the Union, and as they so long as they remain on it are within the jurisdiction of

the United States, the Federal government has authority to govern them, and may govern them either as a territory or as a conquered province.

We trust the time will come when the defunct States will be revived, or more strictly speaking, new States be formed with the old names and boundaries, and admitted into the Union on terms of perfect equality, although this ought not to be done till the rebels have unconditionally surrendered. When they have unconditionally surrendered, and thrown themselves on the mercy of the Federal government, the United States will, no doubt, after having compelled rebel property to pay the expenses of the war, permit the people to reorganize themselves into States, and confirm all who give evidence of loyal intentions, in their former civil and political rights. It will not restore, for it has no constitutional right to restore the relation of master and slave. It cannot deprive free men of their liberty, except for crime. The negroes having been freed by the rebellion of the States whose laws authorized them to be held as slaves, are henceforth free men, and the Federal government must protect and govern them as free men.

Undoubtedly there is something severe in treating the rebellion of a State as State suicide; but we have yet to learn that the way of rebellion ought to be graded, macadamized, and made easy. We see no wisdom or humanity in leaving a State free to rebel, convulse the nation, create a fearful civil war, with all its sacrifices of men and money, and be free to resume its former *status* the moment it ceases fighting, because fighting ceases to be of any avail. No government that has any self-respect, any consciousness of its rights and duties, any regard for justice or the public weal, can ever allow rebellion such impunity. It will make as it ought to make, the way of the political transgressor hard. We must not forget that the States forming the Southern Confederacy have no legal existence, and no legal authority to make war or peace. Every soldier in the National army killed in battle by their soldiers is murdered, just as much murdered as I should be, were a robber to break into my house, and kill me while defending the inviolability of my dwelling and my property. We say not that every Secession soldier who kills a National soldier in battle is a murderer *in foro conscientia*, but we do say the killing of such a soldier is a murder. All our brave soldiers—officers or privates—who have fallen in this civil war

162

have been murdered, barbarously, treacherously murdered ; and every man who voluntarily and knowing what he is about, has entered into the Rebellion, originated, fostered, or in any way aided and abetted it, is answerable, either as principal or accessory, for their murder, and for murdering them while in the discharge of their highest and most solemn duties to their country. This is undeniable ; for they act without warrant of law, and deliberate killing without warrant of law is murder, and murder in the first degree. We hope we shall not be regarded as a moral monster, if we have the harshness to say that we are not willing to pass lightly over the treacherous murder of so many fathers, husbands, sons, and brothers, guilty of no offence but that of rushing at the call of their country to the defence of law, the rights of authority, and the integrity of the nation against traitors and rebels.

We know very well what the Constitution says with regard to the punishment of treason, and also what is the law of Congress on the subject ; but neither the special clause in the Constitution limiting the penalty of treason, nor the special statute of Congress governs the present case. A rebellion, when it rises to certain proportions, and assumes the character of a civil war, is never regarded or expected to be treated as a case of ordinary treason which can be put down by the civil authority. Besides the Constitution and the law relate only to individual traitors, not to treason committed by a State. The rebellion of a State must be treated according to its natural and legal effects. The court in recognizing those effects to be as we have stated, violates no clause of the Constitution and no law of Congress. The court deprives no man of his property beyond the term of his natural life, for he has been deprived of all property which it refuses to recognize as his, by the rebellion of his State. In recognizing the suicide of the State, and leaving its citizens to the consequences of that suicide, it does not confiscate the traitor's property ; it only refuses to restore to him or his children property which had lapsed by the action of his State, before the national authority took possession of it. The law makes the punishment of treason death. The principle of that law is not violated, but conformed to, by treating the rebellion of a State as State suicide. The deceased State leaves no heir, and the nation in assuming and administering its effects, preserves at least the principle of the law. All lapses to the Union,

because under our system a State can have no other successor. Individuals can hold henceforth property once held under its authority only by a law of Congress confirming their titles, or under patents granted by the United States. By the lapse of the State, the whole property held under its authority becomes vested in the United States, the only successor of the State. This we apprehend is the law in the case, and, severe as it is, it inflicts no severer penalty than State treason deserves.

No doubt the property will, in the case of loyal persons, be confirmed to their former owners, as, to some extent, will be their former property to Rebels, after they have given evidence that for the future they will demean themselves as peaceable and loyal citizens. The Government will be bound by justice, and the people of the loyal States will require it, to reorganize civil society in the seceded States at the earliest practicable moment, and with as little change in former possessions and social relations as a due regard for the whole people of the Union will admit. The Constitution has been violated by the Rebels, but nothing we demand or recommend is any violation of that sacred instrument by the Federal authorities. All its provisions will remain intact, and it will be as before, the Constitution of the country.

The great danger now to be guarded against, does not come from the avowed Rebels. At the moment we are writing, our victorious armies have penetrated into Tennessee, and taken possession of its capital, and already we hear that a new State government is soon to be elected, and Tennessee is to have her full representation in both Houses of Congress. The press recommends to the Government, that as fast as a State is reconquered, it shall recognize it as loyal, allow it to elect its State and Federal officers, and resume its place in the Union. Whether the Government will adopt such a policy or not, we know not, for we are not its organ, and are not in its secrets. We hope it will not, for such a policy is, in our judgment, under present circumstances, the shallowest, the maddest, and the most suicidal policy that can be proposed. That such a policy should have been entertained in the beginning of the struggle, can be excused. There was then much to be said in its favor. The Administration did not know its own strength, and could not tell how far it could count on the patriotism of the people. It knew there was a strong Southern and

Pro-slavery party in the Free States, and it had reason to fear that it would prove a disunion party, and make common cause with the Rebels. Besides, it was supposed that there was a strong Union party in the seceding States, whom it was necessary to secure, and who must at any cost be prevented from being irritated and estranged from the national cause. The restoration of the *status quo*, or the suppression of the Rebellion without affecting the *status* of persons held prior to the Rebellion to service, was all that was generally contemplated; or that, except by the very boldest, it was thought prudent to contemplate. Everybody disclaimed all intention of subjugating the Rebellious States, and nearly all were prepared to allow them to return to their allegiance, and to resume their former position in the Union, very much on their own terms. But we are not where we were when President Lincoln issued his first Proclamation; we are not where we were even three months ago. Events have marched, and men have marched with them. The policy which might have been prudent in the beginning, would now be a shameful surrender. We are now in a position to enforce the law in the case, and to make the Rebels pay the just penalty of their treason and rebellion, and to teach State treason a lesson it will never forget.

But precisely now comes our danger, and never at any moment since the secession of South Carolina, has the danger to the Republic been greater or more imminent. The old Pro-slavery party at the North, aided by the Border States nominally in the Union, but in the Union only through fear of our battalions, rears its head, and threatens to render all our sacrifices useless, and all our victories abortive. This party is all the more dangerous, because it professedly adopts what was in the outset apparently the policy of the Administration itself, and claims to approve and sustain the executive—a policy, the useless and dangerous character of which Mr. Conway, of Kansas, in the remarkable speech placed at the head of this article, was the first thoroughly to expose. Let Tennessee and one or two more of the Rebellious States, or even Tennessee alone, be represented, and this party has regained its majority in Congress, and the whole nation is brought again under the domination of the slave interest, represented now principally by the Border States, nominally loyal, but really disloyal. Here is the danger, which will only be increased by any ad-

dition to the representation in Congress of the so-called Union men in the seceding States.

We would not be unjust to the Border States, but we say frankly we have no confidence in their loyalty. It is "neither fish, nor flesh, nor fowl, nor yet good red herring." It is the loyalty of neutrality, like that of the affectionate wife in the battle between her husband and the bear. "Fight Husband, fight Bear; I am neutral." Missouri was for neutrality, and three times have we had to conquer her Secessionists: Kentucky was neutral, that is to say, against the Union; and Maryland would have openly seceded but for the presence of the Federal troops and the timely arrest and imprisonment of a part of her Legislature. Both Missouri and Kentucky are represented in the Rebel Congress, and no doubt would have openly seceded with Virginia and Tennessee, if it had not been for the proximity of the great North-West and a secret conviction that they would serve the cause of Rebellion more effectually in the Union than out of it, or by pretended neutrality than by avowedly taking sides with the Rebels. To these may be added Western Virginia, treated as the old State of Virginia, and allowed her representation in Congress. There are, no doubt, in the Border States nominally within the Union, as well as in the seceded States themselves, individuals who are unsurpassed by any, in any section, for their loyalty to the Union; individuals whom we love and honor, and in whose patriotism we would confide as unreservedly as in our own. But, in general, the Union men in all the Border States, as in the seceded States, are tainted with the heresy of State sovereignty, and are willing to remain in the Union only on condition of dictating its policy, and placing it under the domination of the slave interest. Kentucky never voted to sustain the Union, or to discharge her duty to the Union, till the President had modified General Fremont's Proclamation, freeing the slaves of Rebels, and her prominent men had received assurances that the triumph of the National cause should work no detriment to the "divine and sacred" institution of negro-slavery. Protect slavery, and she will be loyal; leave slavery to follow the surcease of the States that authorized it, and she will go over to the enemy. Such is her loyalty, a conditional loyalty, which we treat as disloyalty, and despise more than open treason and rebellion.

Western Virginia has demonstrated the impolicy of treat-

ing the professed Union men of a seceded State, as a State, and allowing them a Congressional representation. This policy is unjustifiable, and in adopting it, the Government sanctions a more fatal revolutionary principle than that asserted by the Rebellion we are seeking to suppress and extinguish. Mr. Pierrepont may be a very worthy and respectable gentleman, but who thinks of him as the Governor of Virginia, and what court of law would recognize as the acts of Virginia the acts of the pretended government at Wheeling? The recognition of that government of conditional and revolutionary loyalty by the Administration, was worse than a fault, it was a blunder; and it will not do to repeat it. The Administration might have taken, and should have taken military possession of the loyal counties of the Old Dominion, and Congress might have provided for their government as a Territory. But to recognize them as the State of Virginia, and give them the representation of the State in the Senate, and their proportionate representation in the House of Representatives, without any legitimate State action, was a blunder in policy, a blow at legitimate State Rights, and an act of gross injustice to the loyal States, on whom, for the present at least, is thrown the chief burden of saving the Constitution and the integrity and life of the nation.

The policy adopted in the case of Western Virginia, is based on the false assumption that a State, as a State, cannot rebel, and therefore that the several seceding States, as States, are loyal, and that the loyal people of those States retain all their constitutional rights unimpaired by the Act of Secession. This is the grand fallacy which has embarrassed the Administration and Congress from the outset, and greatly impeded its military operations. If the State were, as some pretend, a sovereign State, it could not, we grant, rebel, for in that case there would be no superior on earth for it to rebel against. But if the State is autonomous, a political entity, capable of acting as a political person, and yet subordinate to a superior, it can rebel as well as an individual, and does rebel when it refuses to obey, and takes up arms against the legitimate authority of that superior. The rebellion of a State carries away all the rights, even of loyal persons, depending on their being citizens of a particular State. Such persons are citizens of the United States indeed, but they are no longer citizens of a particular State, and necessarily fall into the condition of persons *squatting*

on Federal territory, for which no State or Territorial government has as yet been organized and put into operation. They have for the present no political rights whatever, and consequently no right of representation in Congress. This is the case of the loyal population even of all the seceded States. Virginia had seceded, and by her act, her whole population were deprived of all the rights of the people of Virginia, for by that act, the people of Virginia ceased to exist.

That a State by rebellion, in case it can rebel, loses its *status* in the Union, and therefore all its rights as a Federal State, we presume will not be questioned. That a State under our political system *can* rebel, we think is undeniable. The generic character of our system is that of a Federal Republic. We are a nation, one nation, and therefore have one national sovereignty, but the government is not a centralized or consolidated government. The government is formed by the Union, not league, of several individual or particular States, or civil and political communities, and in relation to one another separate and independent states. These States have each in its own sphere certain rights, which are not derived from the National government, or held as grants or concessions from it. In other words, all rights and power in the Republic, though held in subordination to the legitimate authority of the National government, do not emanate from it, and are not held subject to its pleasure. The National government recognizes and protects the rights of the States, but does not create, and cannot abrogate them. The matter is best explained by regarding the several States as holding before the Federal government a relation analogous to that held by individuals before civil society. Civil society derives its powers, *mediante* the people as individuals, from God, and hence its legitimacy. But the individual after the creation of civil society, as before its creation, has certain rights, called the rights of man, which he holds by a law antecedent to civil society, which it does not create, cannot revoke, and is bound to recognize and protect as sacred and inviolable, among which, according to the Declaration of American Independence, are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These rights I hold by the patent of my Creator, by the charter of my manhood. They are inalienable, and, so long as I do not forfeit them, the civil society of which I am a member, is bound to protect me in their peaceable

enjoyment. I may hold them up before the State, and say, "These are mine: touch them not." But I may forfeit them by my misdeeds. I forfeit my right to life by murdering my fellowman, and society may hang me. I forfeit my right to liberty by abusing it, and rendering it incompatible with the equal liberty of others. I forfeit my right to pursue my happiness, when I insist on pursuing it in a way destructive of the happiness of others, or in a manner dangerous to the existence or peace of society.

The same may be said of the several States before the Federal government. The Federal government derives its powers from God, through the people as States, and therefore holds them legitimately. Each State has certain rights, which it holds by a law anterior to the Union, and independent of it. But the state may forfeit its rights, and even its existence as a State, because though a State, and in its subordinate sphere a complete State, it is not a sovereign but a subordinate State. It is subordinate, because the United States are made by the Constitution the supreme government. Article VI. of the Constitution says: "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." No language can more clearly assert the constitutional supremacy of the United States, and therefore the subordinate character of each particular State. By making the United States the supreme government, and their Constitution and constitutional acts the supreme law of the land, the American people are made one civil and political people or community—not an aggregation of peoples—a sovereign nation whose sovereignty excludes all others, for sovereignty is and must be one and indivisible. But the powers of Government are, under our system, not concentrated in the same hands, but are divided and distributed among an indefinite number of autonomous though subordinate civil and political communities. These communities, so long as they keep within their sphere, are independent of the Federal Government, and may resist its invasion of their reserved or antecedent rights, as an individual, so long as he abuses none of his rights, may resist any encroachment on them by civil society. So far we assert States' Rights

as an essential element in our political system, and as an element we can never consent to see eliminated. It is the grandest and noblest feature in our institutions. This has always been really our doctrine on the subject; and if in some of our writings we have at times seemed to go farther, we have seemed to go farther than we really intended. We had accepted in early life, Mr. Calhoun's theory of States' Rights, but we never understood this theory to mean the right of a State to secede, or that State sovereignty denied the constitutional supremacy of the Federal government. Mr. Calhoun was a nullifier, but when we knew him he was not a secessionist. "You cannot," said he to us, in 1841, when authorizing us to speak officially for him,—“you cannot coerce a State, because you can never get power enough to do it. So many other States will make common cause with the State it is proposed to coerce, that the Government will be compelled to desist from its attempt, and withdraw the acts that have given offence, and which the State has nullified.” Mr. Calhoun did not deny, as he explained himself to us, the *right*, but simply the *ability*, of the Federal government to coerce a State. The moment it should attempt to coerce the nullifying State, other States would intervene, arrest its action, and compel it to accept a compromise, as in 1832. State sovereignty, in any other sense than that the State derives none of its rights from the Union, and that all the States are independent States in their internal relations to one another, was always, in our judgment, a political heresy; and it is unquestionably this political heresy that has justified, in the minds of the Southern people, the fearful schism they have attempted, and which the Federal authorities are now laboring to suppress.

Conceding that a State has autonomy, but denying its sovereignty, we can consistently maintain that a State, as well as an individual, may rebel. Any person, natural or artificial, that owes allegiance to a superior, is capable of rebellion—because capable of resisting and warring against the legitimate authority of that superior. The States have a superior, since the constitutional acts of the United States are the supreme law of the land, and override their acts. That government, whose acts are the supreme law of the land, is unquestionably the supreme government of the land; and if the Federal government is supreme the States can be only subordinate. If subordinate to the Federal government, they owe it allegiance, and are bound to obey it in

the constitutional exercise of its authority. They being autonomous, capable of self-action, are capable of resisting that authority, refusing it obedience and taking up arms against it, and therefore are capable of rebellion. To say a State can do none of these things because they are illegal, is to overlook the reason of their illegality on the one hand, or to maintain, on the other, that an act done illegally is not done at all. Any act done by the political people called a State, acting through their State organization, and by its authority, is an act of the State in the full and proper sense of the term. The secession ordinances were passed not by the people as population, by the people outside of their state organization, and irrespective of State authority, but by the people as the State, acting through the State organization, and according to the forms of State law. They were passed by the highest authority in the State, and have been recognized, acted on, and enforced by all the authorities of the State, legislative, judicial, executive, and military. In the eyes of the State these Ordinances, and the acts following them, are not illegal, but legal and valid. The individuals in arms against the Federal government are not rebels to their respective States. So far as State acts can go, they are, in relation to their own States, loyal and patriotic citizens, and simply fighting at the command of authority for their country, not against it.

The illegality is not illegality in relation to State authority, but to Federal authority. The acts justify the citizen in the State court, and would, in that court, be a valid plea; but they do not justify the citizen, nor can he plead them, in the Federal courts. They are illegal and void, not because they are not acts of the State, but because they are acts in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and acts in contravention of the supreme authority of the land, which is superior to the State authority, and overrides it. They are illegal, and bind nobody, because they are in contravention of a superior authority, not in but out of the State, and to which the State is bound to conform. The citizen is not bound by them, because the allegiance of the citizen is due to the superior authority, and he is bound to obedience to his State only as far as compatible with that allegiance. The allegiance that can be claimed by a State is a subordinate and conditional allegiance, and is restricted by the higher allegiance due to the national sovereign. The vassal swears to his immediate lord to be his true liegeman,

saving against the lord paramount. The State acts illegally in seceding, but the law it violates is not State law but United States law; and as that law overrides all State law, her illegal acts can bind no citizen of the United States to obedience, not because they are in the State court *non avenues*, but because they are null and void in the Federal courts. Their illegality, therefore, is no proof that they are not acts of the State, or her legal acts, so far as herself is concerned, but a proof that she has usurped the sovereign power, and therefore destroyed herself as a Federal State.

Secession, there can be no question, is rebellion, for it is an act of hostility to the superior, the total denial of the superior's authority. The State, then, in seceding, loses all its rights and its very existence as a civil or political community. The population and territory remain within the jurisdiction of the United States, but the entity called the *state* is out of the Union, as completely so, as if it had never been in it, and therefore is no longer a state at all, for a state without territory or population is a sheer nullity. It does not, as it imagines, become by secession a separate and independent state, because its act being illegal, null, and void, as against the superior, cannot carry either the population or territory essential to its existence with it. It does not fall back on the people in their original and primary capacity, because the people in that capacity are simply population, and the people, as population, so long as they remain on territory within the jurisdiction of the United States, are not an independent people, but simply a part of the population of the United States, bound to obey the constitutional acts of the Federal government as "the supreme law of the land." Its act of secession is simply an act of self-destruction, and the surcease of its authority. Its Secession Ordinance has killed it. The population and territory belong to the Union, but are not in the Union as a State, consequently have no right of representation in the Federal Congress, and, till reorganized into a State or Territory, no political or even civil existence whatever.

That Congress may reorganize the people of the geographical districts vacated by the decease of the seceding States into Territorial governments, and then authorize the Territorial people to assemble in conventions, adopt a State constitution, and apply for admission as States into the Union, we readily concede; but we deny the right of Congress or of the Executive to recognize them as States till they have

been so organized and formally admitted. There is now no State of Tennessee. The State of Tennessee has abdicated, and the word is now only a geographical expression. The gentlemen from the geographical district called Tennessee, now sitting in Congress, are most estimable gentlemen, but they represent no political entity, and have, so far as we can see, not a shadow of right to the seats they occupy. The same must be said of the gentlemen in Congress from Western Virginia. Western Virginia is not and never was a Federal State. It is included in Virginia, and Virginia as a State is no more. The loyal people remaining in the seceding States lost their Federal rights by the suicide of those States. They are not anywhere States or successors of the defunct States, and have no power of themselves to organize themselves into States, with the right of representation in Congress.

The policy we oppose, and which we devoutly pray may never be adopted, is to treat the loyal men found in a seceded State as the State itself, and to recognize the defunct constitution as still in force. But this is only an indirect way of imposing a constitution on a State, the capital error of Mr. Buchanan's Administration with regard to Kansas. These people are not the State, and the old constitution is not in force. Neither Congress nor the Executive can revive that constitution, nor organize these people into a State. Congress can organize them into a Territory, and pass in their favor an "Enabling Act," as it is called. But the act of organizing them into a State, and adopting a State constitution, must be the act of the people themselves, though of a legally recognized and defined Territorial people. These Union men, or the population on the territory of any of the lapsed States, are not such people. For the Federal Government to treat them as such, and allow them to act under the old constitution, and elect State and Federal officers, as in Western Virginia, would strike a deadly blow to constitutional government, and violate in a most flagrant manner our Federal system and the rights of the loyal States.

The States that have remained loyal, and that now constitute the political community called the United States, have the constitutional right to settle the affairs of the nation, without the intervention of gentlemen who have no constitutional right to seats on the floor of either House of Congress. We know to a moral certainty that, if the Gov-

ernment treats as a State the population of each district it recovers from the so-called Confederacy, and concedes them the full State representation in Congress, the *status quo* will be restored, slavery be re-established, the slave interest again be dominant, and our political condition after the war be more disgraceful and humiliating than it was even before. In every one of the seceded States there are, no doubt, Union men, and, as our armies advance, they will become much more numerous. Some will be heartily Union men, a much larger number will be Union men because Secession is the losing and the Union the winning side. Nowhere are these men the State; nowhere can they claim to be the State, or by any State law hold a regular election for either State or Federal offices. There is no possible way for them to perform any legal or constitutional State act. All their acts must lack authority, and in their principle and essence be illegal and revolutionary. To allow them to send representatives to Congress, is therefore an outrage upon the loyal States, which deprives them of their constitutional rights, for these representatives, though representing population, would be the representatives of no State. It would destroy constitutionalism by placing the unorganized and unconstituted population of a geographical division of territory on the same footing with a legally organized and constituted State. It is States according to population, not population simply that is represented in the Lower House of Congress, and States alone that are represented in the Upper House or Senate. Let those who are ready to adopt this policy, and who profess to be the special friends of the Constitution ponder this well.

These people in Tennessee, North Carolina, and Arkansas, that it is proposed, under these names, to treat as States, even if loyal, are not and never were States. They are in all the States named, we presume, only a minority, though that is not fatal, for it is only the loyal majority of a legally constituted people that is of moment. Now, to allow this population to be represented in Congress is an outrage on the Federal principle of our government. We then make population alone, not States, the people represented, and thus in principle convert our Republic from a Federal to a Centralized Republic, and sanction the wildest and most irregular democracy ever broached by the most rabid Jacobin or Radical. We should not in this way preserve our Federal system, our Federal constitution, but should revolu-

tionize and destroy it. We should put an end to the Republic of Washington and Adams, Jefferson and Madison, and attempt the dangerous experiment of a pure, centralized democracy. We are not prepared for such a revolution. We love our country with all her faults, for she is *our* country; but we love her institutions, because we have studied them, and believe them the wisest and best the world has yet seen. It is our political civil constitution, not our learning, our science, our polish, or our personal morals, that places us in the front rank of the grand army of civilization. To destroy the Federal element in these institutions would ruin them, and ruin the country no less than Secession itself, for all centralism is absolutism, whether democratic or monarchical centralism. We should err on the one hand, were we to adopt it, as much as the Confederates do on the other.

Receive back, without territorial discipline, the seceded States the moment they cease fighting, because fighting has become a losing game, and you simply pay a premium for rebellion, and make treason more profitable than loyalty. The Border State representation, aided by Democratic proslavery representatives, and a few renegade Administration members, even now all but control Congress, and make it well nigh impossible to pass any comprehensive measure punishing Rebels, or for indemnifying loyal men, by confiscating Rebel property. The slave interest is nearly as dominant in Congress now as it was before the secession of Toombs and Davis, Slidell and Mason, Wigfall and Hunter. It must be protected at all hazards. No damage must be done it, whatever becomes of loyalty. It thwarts the patriotic action of Congress, and has from the outset paralyzed the arm of the Executive, only just now beginning to be emancipated. For a long time every military precaution was neglected lest the Border States should be irritated and secede; and the finest months in the season for military operations were suffered to wear away without any thing being done, and the wisest strategic movements were sternly forbidden to be made, and the most important strategic points were left to the enemy, lest the Union men of Kentucky should vote to join the Confederates. Let now Tennessee, North Carolina, Arkansas, and one after another of all the seceded States return to the Union, and send their delegations to Congress, and it is easy to foresee the injustice that will be done to loyalty.

If one thing more than another should be insisted on, it is that the expenses of putting down the Rebellion should be paid out of the property of the Rebels, of Rebel States and Rebel individuals. This is alike the dictate of justice and sound policy. But even as Congress is now constituted this could hardly be effected. Let all the seceded States come back, and the United States would soon find that, in addition to the Federal debt, in addition to the damages done to the property of so-called loyal men, by either army, Federal or Confederate, the Federal treasury would be drawn upon to pay the scrip of the Confederacy, and discharge all the obligations contracted by the Rebels in their war against the Union. Some Northern "doughface"—say the Honorable Mr. Diven, of New York, for instance, could be found to introduce a Bill to that effect; it would be supported by all the Union men of the Border States from interest and the desire to stand well with their neighbors, late rebels to the Government, by the whole Southern delegation, as a matter of course, and by a fair share of Northern men who would be anxious to prove that the era of good feeling had returned, and that they entertained no grudge against their Southern brethren, and the Bill would be passed, if necessary, even over the Presidential Veto. As sure as the armies of the Union continue to be victorious, and the seceded States are suffered to return to the Union the moment they lay down their arms, this is what will be done. It will be the Rebels, not the Loyalists, to whom will inure the victory. Slavery will again be in power, and the Cotton Lords will dominate as of old in the halls of Congress, the Executive chair, and the Departments, threatening anew, if we of the Free States show any disposition to assert our own rights, to secede, to convulse the nation again with civil war, to murder again our fathers, husbands, sons, and brothers, till they break our spirit, and we become as tame and docile as their own negroes. Is this the premium to be paid for treason? And this the penalty to be inflicted on loyalty?

We trust in God that the Federal government will never adopt, or, rather, that it will not persist in so insane and suicidal a policy. We trust that it will abandon the *πρότον πσεύδον* with which it started, and will understand that a State may secede, that State secession is State suicide, and that the Slaveholding States, by seceding, have lapsed as States, and that even loyal men inhabiting

the geographical territories once under their jurisdiction have lost by the lapse of their respective States, all right of Federal representation; while it itself is absolved from all obligation to protect or to recognize any of their municipal rights derived from State legislation, or State authority alone. By the secession of the rebellious States, and by the rebellion of the greater part of the slaveholders throughout the non-seceding Slaveholding States, slavery is legally well-nigh extinguished. We earnestly beseech the Government, whatever it may do in regard to slavery in Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, and Delaware, it will never recognize its existence anywhere else, and resist *à outrance* the return of the slave interest to power. As sure as it exists in the nation, that interest will rule it, for it must rule or die. We plead not now for the black alone, but for the white also; not for the abolition of slavery, but especially against reducing again to slavery the recently emancipated free men of the North. Nowhere on territory under the usurped rule of the so-called Confederacy, has black slavery to-day any legal existence. We say to the negroes of all the seceding States, you are free. No law or usage now in force binds you to service. The rebellion of your masters has restored you to the ownership of yourselves. Your wives and children are your own. Let the Federal government refuse to suffer you to be remanded to slavery, and you will be free, and the poor white men of the North will also be free.

The two most important measures ever introduced into the American Congress are, first, the Resolutions of Mr. Sumner in the Senate, declaring that a State by rebellion commits suicide, and, second, General Ashley's bill in the House, from the Territorial Committee, providing for the Government of the Rebellious States as Territories. We fear the Democratic and Border State influence, aided by a certain number of "doughfaced" Republicans, may be too strong for their friends, and defeat the whole utility of the war, by forcing the acceptance of some base, timid, and disgraceful compromise; but they are wise and noble measures, almost the only measures introduced into the present Congress that belong to high and comprehensive statesmanship. Let those measures be adopted, and our government will rise from its degradation, will reassume its majestic port and step, and command anew the admiration of the world. Their adoption would save

constitutional government, and give new guaranties of man's capacity for freedom. But whether these measures be adopted or not, Mr. Sumner's Resolutions will serve as a platform on which will take their stand all in the country worthy of consideration for their political sagacity, their wise statesmanship, their disinterestedness, and their nobility of sentiment.

Never have we trembled more for the fate of the Republic than we do at this moment when the shouts of victory are ringing in our ears. Yet we do not despair. If the present Congress fails in its duty, we shall regret it. If it receives back revolted States, and restores them to their former *status*, permitting them to remand the persons now legally free to their former servitude, we shall blush for our country, and hold that she knows not how to avail herself of this, her hour of visitation; but we shall not cease to labor for liberty, or to hope for its final triumph. We shall, if slavery be re-established in the territory of Rebelldom, hold the Federal government and the whole nation responsible for it, and therefore treat slavery as a matter that comes legitimately within the sphere of the political action of the citizens of non-Slaveholding States. It will then be our business as much as it would be if we lived in South Carolina or Tennessee. We shall then have the right to agitate the slave question politically, for the adoption of the policy we oppose makes slavery, if it exists anywhere on the territory of the seceded States, henceforth a national and not a mere State question. The Government and people may be sure, if the policy we have opposed prevails, they will find it necessary, though in a different way, to reckon with the friends of freedom as well as with the friends of slavery.

If the view of State suicide we have taken be accepted, and the Territorial Government Bill before Congress adopted, the slave interest will be crushed in all except the Border States, now nominally in the Union. The slavery question when confined to these Border States, will not amount to much. The slaves of Rebels may be liberated under a confiscation act, and the few owned by loyal masters may be liberated under the war power, and their owners indemnified, or they may be purchased and set free, or, in fine, left as they are. In these States slavery will not long remain, after it is abolished farther south, and the market for their surplus stock of slaves is cut off. Confined to these States and forbidden to expand, it will soon die

out. We are far from being sanguine that there is either statesmanship enough, or love of liberty enough, left in the country, to adopt, though evidently legal, constitutional, and just, the policy we recommend. There is one cause that operates powerfully in keeping the negro in bondage, the horror of Africanizing free American society. This horror is the greatest obstacle the friends of freedom have to overcome. The majority of the people in the Free States are anti-abolitionists, not because they approve of slavery, but because they do not like the negro for an associate, a neighbor, or a fellow-citizen. They believe he is a man, wish him to enjoy the rights of man, but not in their community. Not a few of these believe with the late Mr. Calhoun, that if the two races are to live on the same territory, it is best both for the white race and the negro race that the negro should be retained in the condition of a slave. Here is the great obstacle in the way of adopting Mr. Sumner's and General Ashley's policy. If the slaves were of the white race, that policy would be speedily adopted, and our Republic made in reality, as well as in name, a free Republic.

We have no space left for the discussion of this question. We suppose we share in the common prejudice against the negro race, and have no wish to see our free American society Africanized. But prejudice, however strong, must not be permitted to override justice. We are not now pleading for the abolition of slavery, but against its re-establishment. In all the seceding States the slaves are freed, and what we ask is, that their freedom should be recognized. We want them treated as freemen: of their social and political *status* we say nothing. If recognized as freemen, we think, as white men press in to take their place as laborers, they would gradually, yet effectually, disappear from our Republic by emigration to Hayti, or other black communities, where they can be free, and form integral portions of communities of their own race. We would urge no forced colonization; we would compel no emigration, but we believe the force of circumstances would lead them to emigrate, and we should have no objection to the Government taking measures to facilitate and aid their emigration, providing their emigration is voluntary on their part, like the emigration hither of Irish and Germans. However this may be, we insist that no prejudice of race or color should induce us to remand to slavery those, who by the crimes of their masters, or the surcease of the State authorities

making them slaves, are now legally freemen. We must insist on this as an act of justice to them, as a duty we owe to God, and cannot neglect with impunity, and as the only way of saving the country from the domination of the slave interest, and enabling it to live, flourish, and fulfil its civilizing mission.

-
- ART. IV.—1. *The Uprising of a Great People. The United States in 1861. To which is added a Word of Peace on the Difference between England and the United States.* From the French of COUNT AGENOR DE GASPARIN. By MARY L. BOOTH. New American Edition, from the Author's Revised Edition. New York: Scribner. 1862. 12mo. pp. 298.
2. *Our Country and the Church.* By N. L. RICE, D. D. New York: Scribner, 1861. 12mo. pp. 93.

COUNT GASPARIN'S book on the "Uprising of a Great People," is a remarkable book for its keen foresight, its broad statesmanlike views, its inspiring eloquence, and its noble sentiments. Our only wish while reading it is, that our countrymen were less unworthy of the high praise the enlightened French nobleman awards them. The election of Mr. Lincoln in 1860 to the Presidency was indeed a great event, less indeed on account of the man elected than on account of the cause he represented; and we are not surprised that foreigners, who are strongly opposed to slavery, should have regarded it with interest, and greeted it with pleasure and hope. Under the circumstances, it was an act of courage, and not undeserving of admiration.

Yet there was less real courage in the actors generally than appeared to on-lookers from abroad, for comparatively few of those who voted for Mr. Lincoln, believed any real danger was to be apprehended. The Southern politicians threatened loudly, every body knew; but not many, if any, in the Republican party believed their threats were in earnest, or were any thing more than a part of the machinery usually put in operation before elections. The Northern politicians opposed to the Republican party assured us that this time the South were in downright earnest; and that if the Republicans should dare elect their candidate, there

would surely be separation or civil war, or perhaps both ; but we believed it only an ordinary trick of politicians to serve their own personal or party purposes, and we could hardly do otherwise, since we found them offering no word of rebuke to their Southern allies, and not one manly word in defence of the constitutional freedom of election. Their warnings we believed selfish, uncalled for, and we felt that, when addressed to Republicans, they were addressed to the wrong party. The tears they shed over the dangers to the Union, seemed to us only tears shed over their own probable displacement from power ; and history will forever throw on the Union-loving and Union-saving Democrats and their allies, who would save the Union by surrendering it, bound hand and foot, to slavery, the guilt of the rebellion, which their depravity and want of manhood, of true and enlightened patriotism, encouraged and well-nigh rendered successful. Yet certain it is that they whose votes elected Mr. Lincoln, did not generally believe either separation or civil war would follow his election. They believed the Democratic party, South as well as North, would acquiesce in the election, when it was over and the new Administration fairly inaugurated. This was in accordance with all past experience, and they had no special reason to believe the present election would prove an exception to the general rule.

How many of them would have voted for Mr. Lincoln if they had believed any serious attempt would be made to put the threats loudly vociferated by politicians into execution, or if they had clearly foreseen the course since taken, it is not possible to determine. It can never be known, and, perhaps, it is better that it should not be known. The architect sometimes builds better than he knows. But this is certain, that many prominent Republicans, when they saw the wolf had really come, that Southern threats were not mere bullying, but did mean something, showed the white feather, and were prepared to avert the coming storm by new and larger concessions to slavery, and to purchase peace at the expense of throwing away the fruits of the victory they had just won after a hard-fought battle. The Republican party were saved from a disgraceful compromise, not, perhaps, so much by their own virtue, as by the madness of the Southern politicians, who, disgusted with their Democratic allies of the Free States, and resolved on separation and reconstruction, or, if you will, on separation

alone, would listen to no compromise, and declared that they would not come back into the Union, even if left at liberty to prescribe their own terms. Their madness, rather than our virtue, saved us at the critical moment, and left us no alternative, but to consent peaceably to separation, or to fight for the Union, and crush out secession by force of arms. The merit of the Republicans is that they had the virtue, the manliness, the patriotism, to choose the latter alternative.

We ourselves voted for Mr. Lincoln, because we felt that it had become necessary for the country to commence the work of breaking and annihilating the political power of slavery, which had almost from the origin of the Government dominated in the Administration. The domination of the slave interest was corrupting our politics both North and South, was blackening our reputation in the eyes of the civilized world, and undermining the public and private morals of the people. We did not believe secession or civil war, though threatened, would follow, and, even if we had so believed, should still have voted for Mr. Lincoln all the same. We should only have felt it so much the more necessary to do so. We stated in some remarks to our fellow-citizens, urging them to support the Republican party, that we wished the power of the slave interest broken, and that, if civil war should follow, we would welcome and meet it as the sons of the heroes of the Revolution should meet it. We wished the question, which was sure sooner or later to come up, to be met and disposed of in our day, so that we might, when called to our own final account, know whether we left our children a heritage of freedom or not. There are, we said, greater evils for a nation than civil war. The loss of liberty is greater, the loss of public and private virtue is greater, and greater by far is the loss of that patriotism that counts it sweet to die for one's country, or that heroism which dares do or suffer anything and every thing in defence of the just and noble cause. We did not believe the South would secede, openly rebel, but, if they did, if they chose to fight, we were for meeting them, and giving them fight for fight to their hearts' content. Whether the majority of Republicans at that time could have said as much, may be doubted, but their purposes and ours were the same, and they have for the most part shown no deficiency of pluck when they found themselves forced to meet the stern realities of war.

We confess, however, that in voting with the Republican party, we were not moved by any special regard for the negroes held in bondage. We were, as a matter of course, opposed to slavery, and wished there were no slaves and no negroes in the country. The system was bad, detestable, abominable, but we of the non-slaveholding States were not responsible for it. It was a local matter, and its disposition a matter for the States that authorized it, with which we had no civil or political right to interfere. Our motive was not to abolish slavery where it had a legal, or *quasi*-legal existence, but to restrain and finally abolish the political power of the slave interest, by sternly forbidding its expansion into new territory, and the admission of any additional Slave States into the Union. We opposed the extension of slavery, not on abolition principles, not for the sake of slavery itself, but for the sake of emancipating and purifying American politics, because we found the interest created by slavery stronger in Federal politics than any other one interest in the country, and able by its combinations and alliances to carry our Presidential elections, and to shape the policy of the Federal Government, in a sense necessarily antagonistical to the general interests of the immense majority of the people of the United States. We found it dominant, and laboring, not without success, to render its domination complete and perpetual. It had the feeble Administration of Mr. Buchanan on its side; it had got an opinion of the Supreme Court in its favor; it had fifteen States out of thirty-three, the majority of voters in three or four, and large minorities in all of the other States, pledged to its support, and we felt bound to do all we could constitutionally to overthrow it. It was not liberty for the black race so much as for the white race, that we wished to secure. It was not the abolition of negro-slavery, but the redemption and preservation of the glorious Republic inherited from our fathers, that moved us. We did not propose to interfere with slavery where it had a recognized legal existence, and were prepared to adhere strictly to the so-called "Compromises of the Constitution," and to pay the slaveholders their pound of flesh cut from the region nearest the heart. It was only the *political* power of slavery we sought to eliminate. So was it with us personally, and so, we presume, was it with the great majority of those who voted in 1860 for the Republican candidates. The Republican party were denounced at the North as well as at the

South by the Bell and Everett men, and by both wings of the Democratic party as an abolition party; but an abolition party they were not, and had no thought of becoming.

But there is a logic in events, and men who adopt the principles of a movement are carried farther than they foresee or are prepared for in the outset. All great movements have their law, and must and will on to their legitimate conclusion. The developments and events since the Presidential election, have carried us far beyond the point we had then reached, and have made evident, what should have been evident to us from the first, that it is impossible to annihilate the political power of the slave interest, without annihilating that interest itself, and that it is impossible to annihilate that interest without the complete emancipation of the slaves, and their recognition as free population. We have seen three or four Slave States nominally in the Union, and having, comparatively speaking, only a small number of slaves, for over a year embarrassing the action of the Government, preventing much necessary legislation, paralyzing the Administration, impeding its military operations, and rendering useless the most costly sacrifices. For six weeks after the inauguration of the present Administration, the military defences of the country were neglected, forts and arsenals, the armory at Harper's Ferry, the navy yard and naval armaments at Gosport were left unprotected, lest the Border States should be irritated and secede, and there was even thought of abandoning on one and the same day Sumter, Pickens, and all the posts still held by the Union in the seceded States. Even after the war had commenced, and we had a powerful army in the field, it was pretended that its principal object was to defend the National Capital, while all thought of subjugating the rebellious States was officially disclaimed. Even Congress, at its extra session, passed almost unanimously, at least without serious debate, a resolution declaring that the war having been forced upon the United States by the rebels in the seceding States, would be prosecuted solely to the end of putting down the rebellion, without any intention of interfering with the property or institutions of those States. All this was done through the influence of the slave interest in the non-seceding slave States. That interest is hardly less controlling in Congress to-day than it was under the Administration of the feeble Buchanan. Maryland, Delaware, Western Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, have inherited the mantle of the more

Rev. O. A. Brownson .

1862.]

Emancipation and Colonization.

225

Southern States, and succeeded to their power. Even now not a step can be taken without reckoning with the slave interest.

This fact alone suffices to show that there is no way of emancipating the Government from the slave power, but by treating slavery as abolished, but by destroying the property in slaves, and never suffering a slave interest again to grow up anywhere within the limits of the United States. This we can now do without any violation of constitutional law, or breach of constitutional duty, for the secession of the slaveholders has given the Federal Government jurisdiction over the whole subject. Slavery, if suffered to exist in any part of the Union at all, will compel all other interests to succumb to it, because it is antagonistical in its very essence to all other interests. If it exists in the Union at all, the interest it creates must be placed on a footing of equality with every other interest, and be counted as legitimate, and as sacred as the interest of freedom. If allowed equality, it will from its nature claim superiority, and dominate, because equality can be predicated only of things homogeneous, and there is no homogeneousness between liberty and slavery. The equality of the slave interest can in the nature of the case mean only the right of slavery to restrain and repress freedom, for the advance of freedom is the destruction of slavery. We can, then, secure an open field for freedom, and prevent the slave interest from dominating, only by abolishing it, and recognizing the slaves as free. The Republic to subsist and flourish must either be all free or all slave.

In the slaveholding States themselves the slave-owners are only a small minority, and yet this minority is the ruling class, and to the interests of slavery the interests of the non-slaveholding whites are sacrificed. The seven and a half millions of non-slaveholding whites are of the same race as ourselves—are, by nature, as hardy, as brave, as energetic, and as ingenious as we are, and yet, even their material prosperity, notwithstanding their more genial climate, and their richer and more productive soil, cannot compare with ours. The blight of slavery is on them, because all their interests must be sacrificed to the interests of the slaveholders. They have comparatively few schools, few private or public libraries, and in many parts of the South are below the level of the most degraded peasantry of Europe. We sympathize with these people, who are fitted

by nature, and by their favored climate and soil to stand in the foremost ranks of the free American people. Not a few of those brave Union troops who fought at Belmont, and conquered at Logan's Cross Roads, at Henry, and at Donelson, were either from this class or their descendants, and are only a sample of what the whole would be, if the curse of slavery were removed, and they lived in a land of freedom. Why shall these seven millions of free whites, of the same stock with ourselves, and by nature every way our equals, be sacrificed to the slaveholding oligarchy which rules them with a rod of iron, and prevents the development and growth of their innate genius and greatness? They, not the slaveholders, are the real people of the South, and, if united hand and heart with us of the North, would contribute their full share toward making the American people the greatest and noblest people on earth.

Now, to emancipate these non-slaveholding whites of the slaveholding States, who, as a population, dislike slavery far more than do the population of the non-slaveholding States, to emancipate national politics, and free labor both North and South, and to make the North and the South really one people, one in their system of labor, one in their institutions, culture, and affections, it is necessary to put an end to slavery, and to induce—not force—and aid, as fast and as far as practicable, the freed men of the African race to emigrate to some tropical region congenial to their constitution and temperament, where they may form a great cotton, rice, coffee, and tobacco-growing and exporting people by themselves, leaving the whole territory of the United States to the white race. This is what is necessary, and the assurance of the Government that it will adopt and carry out the policy of emancipation and settlement of the blacks in a congenial climate, beyond the limits of the United States, would make these seven millions, or seven millions and a half, of non-slaveholding whites its fast friends, and friends who would fight for it with a heartiness and zeal they have never manifested in fighting the battles of the slaveholders, for it is not slavery they would retain, but the Africanization of free American society they would avert. They hold no slaves; they resist all amalgamation with the negro race, leaving that to slave-owners and overseers; they believe the negro a man with the natural rights of man; they think him different from themselves—do not regard him as a white man; they wish him well; but they do not want negroes for neighbors, as-

sociates, fellow-citizens, or voters. They see and know well, if freed and remaining as laborers, they will do so only as a degraded class, and so long as a considerable portion of the labor of the country is performed by a socially degraded class, they understand perfectly well that labor will never rise from its degradation, and it be held honorable to labor. It is therefore they join the slaveholders against abolition; but if it could be made clear to them that free American society would not be Africanized, and that in a reasonable time the African element of the American population would be eliminated, there would be no more resolute, determined, and invincible abolitionists in the country. To accomplish, then, the destruction of the political power of slavery, and to make the American people really one people, complete emancipation and colonization are necessary.

This is the conclusion to which events, our own reflections, and the suggestions of others have brought us. But the greatest obstacle to the realization of the good aimed at, is in the Free, not in the slave states. The Abolitionists are opposed to the colonization feature of emancipation, as are also the political economists, and most of our old Democratic and pro-slavery politicians. The Abolitionists demand the abolition of slavery on the ground that slavery is unjust, a sin, and no people has the right to tolerate it. The slaves must be freed as an act of simple justice to them, and, when freed, they are freemen, and we have no more right to colonize them than we have to colonize any other class of freemen. They have the same right to live in the country that we who propose to colonize them have. Besides, if it is necessary to colonize, why not colonize their late masters, whom we can much better spare? The economists add that we need the labor of the blacks, and that to deport four millions of the laboring population, to say nothing of the expense of doing it, would derange the labor market, diminish production, and impoverish the country, almost to a ruinous extent. To the economists it may be conceded that the loss of labor would be great, and be a serious blow to production, if we suppose them all deported at once, and their places unsupplied from other sources. But the process of removal must, on any supposition, spread over a considerable space of time; and as their removal leaves a vacuum, white labor will rush in to fill it, and keep up the equilibrium between demand and supply. There would undoubtedly be for a time some derangement, some difficulty, and

some loss ; but here, as everywhere else, supply would soon follow the demand, and the labor market of the world is generally overstocked with white laborers.

To the Abolitionists it may be replied that the question is not a question of colonizing the freed men of the African race for the interest or pleasure of their late masters. We make little of these late masters, and are quite willing, if thought best, that they should be deported to Africa, to become, if they wish, slave-drivers for their friend and ally the king of Dahomey. We demand nothing as a concession to their interests and feelings ; we consult only the interests of the whole country, and the rights, feelings, and interests of the non-slaveholding whites in the Slave States, the seven millions or seven millions and a half, the real Southern people, who own no slaves, and are as much opposed to slavery as we are. We think it would be better, as well as easier, to colonize four millions of the African race, than to colonize those seven and a half millions of the white race.

The other objection of the Abolitionists cannot be so lightly dismissed. It professes to be founded in justice, and asserts that to deport the slaves after their freedom would be a violation of their liberty, and therefore an act of injustice. This is a grave objection, and should be gravely considered. If the Abolitionists are chargeable with having given too little weight to political interests, or political expediency, we who have opposed them are, perhaps, even more chargeable with having made too little account in our political calculations of justice, which overrides, and should override, all other considerations. It will not do for us, when settling up the past, and taking a fresh start for the future, to neglect the strict and stern demands of justice. We cannot hope to repair one sin by another, or an act of injustice by an act of injustice. This is certain. Let justice stand though the heavens fall ; for justice is the basis of all institutions worth preserving, and the condition of all real prosperity, social or individual. To forget justice is to forget God ; and all the nations that forget God shall perish, as all history proves.

We grant that slavery is not only a political wrong, not only an evil to the free whites, but an injustice to the slave himself, and must be abolished for his sake alone. We are willing on this point to sing our palinode, and frankly confess that we have never given to this feature in the slave question its due consideration. Many others are very likely in

the same predicament with ourselves. Slavery is a wrong done to the slave, the greatest possible wrong that can be done him. It is an outrage upon his manhood, an outrage which debases and disfigures in him that very image of God in which he was created. It is a supreme sophism, utterly repugnant to the dialectic harmony of God's creation. The negro is a man, and slavery is as great an outrage of the rights and dignity of manhood in the black man as in the white man. We have never denied or overlooked this, but we have not given it in our calculations all the weight it deserved. On this point the abolitionists have exaggerated nothing; and they have said no more than the simple truth when they have said strict justice demands the immediate and unconditional emancipation of the slave. But, practically considered, the real and complete act of emancipation is a complex act, and cannot be performed instantaneously and at once. The act is not, and cannot be, one simple isolated act. It has its relations, and its relations on all sides, the consideration of which does and must enter into and form a part of the act itself. In doing even an act of justice to the slave, we must take care so to do it, that if it results in evil to him it shall be through his fault, not ours. Certainly justice must never give place to expediency; but we must take care that justice be done in the best practicable manner, and be as complete as possible.

The question of emancipation, from the Abolitionist point of view, is one of reparation of wrong done to the slave by slavery. This wrong is not confined to the simple deprivation of liberty, and is not repaired by simply declaring him free. Slavery has done him a greater wrong than such a declaration repairs. It has injured him in the habits it has generated, in the obstacles it has interposed to his intellectual and moral development, and in disqualifying him for fair competition, in the race for equality, in a community where the white element predominates. This injury cannot be repaired at once, and by a single stroke of the pen. The obligation of setting about repairing it immediately or at once, is imperative, and all avoidable delay is criminal, is an augmentation of the wrong done to the slave; but it is not imperative that the reparation should be instantly completed. For completing it time may be demanded, and many things besides declaring the slave free may be necessary to be done, which cannot be done all at once. There are vested rights to be considered and adjusted, the rights

of others—we mean not the slaveholders—are to be consulted, and care has to be taken that no injustice be done to other and innocent parties. It is always easier to do a wrong than it is to undo it. We are not at liberty to undo the wrong to the slave by doing a wrong to the free. It is just to abolish slavery against the will of their pretended owners, for their ownership being founded in injustice is invalid, save as against the community that authorized it; but to force upon the free non-slaveholding Southern society four millions of negroes, to take their place in that society against its will, on a footing of equality, or, in other words, to Africanize free non-slaveholding society against its consent, is not an act of justice, but may be an act of injustice. To do it strikes at the freedom of that society, and without repairing the injustice done to the slave; for the slaves, liberated by a stroke of the pen, and let loose in such a society, with which they could not amalgamate, would not and could not be really free. They cannot be free and equal members of a society that instinctively repels them, and can remember them only as having been slaves. They can, in the Southern States, with here and there an individual exception, be only slaves or pariahs, and to leave them pariahs is not to repair the injustice of slavery. Even not counting for the moment the invasion of the rights of the non-slaveholding people of the South by the infusion of four millions of blacks into their free society against their will, the government has the right to treat the negroes heretofore held as slaves, and would be bound to treat them, as wards so far and so long as necessary for their transition from slavery to freedom in the best practicable way for their own interest.

We hold the slaves in all the seceded States have been freed from their former owners, whose rebellion has annulled the only law by which they were held to service. The Federal government in succeeding to the defunct States cannot remand the slaves to their former condition, cannot hold them to service to the United States, nor sell them as vacated or confiscated property. It cannot treat them as property at all, but must treat them as persons, though persons under its authority, and for whose future *status* and welfare it is bound in justice to provide. They properly become wards of the United States, who have over them the authority, and owe them the duty, of guardians. They are to be regarded in law and even in justice as under age, as

not having as yet attained to their majority, and, if the United States as their guardian honestly believe that their colonization in a congenial climate and productive soil, where they may form a civil community and an independent sovereign state of their own race, they have the right, and it is their duty to colonize them, if practicable.

We know the answer of the Abolitionists. They say, you must immediately and at once recognize the slaves as freemen; and, when you have so recognized them, they stand on the same footing of equality with any other class of freemen. Being freed, to colonize or deport them without their choice and consent, would be to violate the very freedom you have recognized as theirs. When you recognize them as freemen, you recognize in them the inalienable right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." You deny that right, when you deny to them the right to live, to be free, and to pursue their happiness, where it best pleases them. When you claim the right to deport them, except for crime, you make a distinction between them and white men, as unjust in principle as slavery itself. The Abolitionists demand not only the freedom of the slave as a man, the complete and unreserved recognition of his manhood, but the full and unreserved recognition of the equality of the negro race with the white race. They demand freedom for the slave in the name of the universal brotherhood of the human race, as a man and a brother, and therefore demand that this brotherhood be recognized, and the negro be placed on a footing of perfect equality with the white race in one and the same civil and political community; and therefore they hold that the forced colonization of the African race in a community by themselves is an act of injustice to the members of that race which no plea of expediency or utility can ever justify.

Let no man treat this answer of the Abolitionists with contempt. There is in it an homage paid to justice, which commands our reverence. We recognize the brotherhood of the human race, in the sense that all men of whatever temperament or complexion have had the same origin, have sprung from the same original pair, Adam and Eve. So far, as a Christian, a philosopher, a man, we have no doubt or misgiving. But there is the fact of human degeneracy, called by theologians original sin, which must be taken into the account. The fact of this degeneracy is evident to every one who will compare the ideal or typical man pre-

sented by his own reason and conscience, with the actual state of men as he finds them. This degeneracy, as sin, or considered in regard to its *culpa* or guilt, is the same in all men, for it was committed alike by all in Adam. But, taken as simple degeneracy, as a simple fact in man's natural history, it has various degrees, and from these various degrees spring what we call *races*, which are not properly distinct races, but simple varieties in one and the same race. The degeneracy is greater in some and less in others. Some have departed farther than others from the primitive type. Why, or wherefore, we have no space now to inquire. We restrict ourselves to the simple statement of the fact. The least degenerated variety is that commonly called the Caucasian; the most degenerated is the African.* The African is the lowest variety, and stands farthest removed from the true ideal or typical man. The Caucasian variety has suffered from original sin, has degenerated from the proper human type, but it has degenerated the least of any of the known varieties of the human family. Whether we consider the Caucasian man, physically, intellectually or

* We know the assertion in the text has been disputed by some Abolitionists, who seem to place the negro in proper humanity above the Caucasian; but they are led for the most part to do so, we apprehend, because the Caucasian has made his assumed superiority a reason, and, indeed, a full justification of his enslavement and oppression of the negro. This is abominable, and directly opposed to the Christian rule: "Let him that is greatest among you be your servant." It is the duty of the superior to protect the inferior, of the strong to help the weak, not to oppress them. But some have asserted it on the ground that the natural qualities and virtues of the negro approach nearer to the Christian type than those of the Caucasian; but this is in consequence of that false view of Christian worth, which has in our times, and especially in our country, originated what has been not inaptly called "Woman Worship," and which this war is likely to abolish, perhaps to supplant by an opposite idolatry, known as "Muscular Christianity." The tendency has for some time been strong to regard the soft, gentle, passive virtues as those best responding to the Christian type, and in these virtues it has been assumed the negro surpasses the Caucasian; but this comes from taking the femininity of our religion as superior to its masculinity. Woman is made the type *par excellence* of the Christian virtues, and the more feminine the man, the more of a Christian he is. But this is to forget that man is asexual [non-sexual] and sexual, while woman is all sexual, and that it is the asexual that responds to the Christian type. Woman is called an "angel" by poets, sentimentalists, and even grave divines, but woman is less angelical than man, for the angels are asexual, that is, have no sex, "neither marry nor are given in marriage," and man is asexual as well as sexual,—expressed by Madame de Staël, we think it is, when she says, "Love is an episode in the life of man, but it is the whole life of woman." To make the peculiar feminine virtues the superior, and therefore woman the head of the man, is not only to reverse all theology, all the ideas of mankind, nay, language itself, but it is to place the inchoate above the complete, the passive above the active, the potential above the actual, which were absurd and ridiculous in philosophy.

morally, he is the nearest approach to the integral man now to be found.

Between one variety and another there is an interval. This interval is greatest between the negro and the Caucasian, and between these it is too great to be leaped by a single bound. The two varieties do not easily amalgamate. Their amalgamation is in some sense unnatural and violent, and the amalgam is a deterioration. We know amalgamation is not contemplated by the Abolitionists generally; but how is it to be prevented? Do you propose to forbid it by law? By what right, if you deny all distinction in the case, and assert the black and white races are equal? Do you say that intermarriage between blacks and whites will not be sought; that white persons will prefer to marry white persons, and black persons will prefer to marry black persons? You may be right. We believe such will be the case. We believe that there is an instinctive aversion on both sides, but especially on the part of the white race, to such intermarriage. It is doubtful if a white man or white woman ever cohabits with a black of the other sex, unless moved to it by lust or some morbid affection; and we believe the black man prefers a black woman for his wife, or a black woman a black man for her husband. Intermarriage between the two races, we apprehend, strikes both as improper and undesirable, and is pretty sure not to take place to any considerable extent.

But in saying this, we say all; we settle the question that blacks and whites do not and cannot without more or less violence form one and the same community, and live together in one and the same society on the footing of equality. There can be no society between persons who have a mutually instinctive aversion to intermarriage; for marriage is the basis of the family, and the family is the basis of general society; when therefore the different races or varieties are separated by too broad an interval for the family union, it is clear that they cannot form one and the same society. They cannot live in one and the same civil and political society as equal, but one will be held superior and the other inferior. There is no real society or community where there is no intermarriage, and if they inhabit the same territory, the blacks and the whites, not intermarrying, cannot form one people. They will be two distinct peoples in one state, in which the stronger will predominate and oppress the weaker. This is inevitable and conclu-

sive against the notion of forming the liberated slaves of the negro-family into one people and society with the freemen of the white family.

The amalgamation of the two varieties, separated as they are by so great an interval, would be undesirable, even if it were less impracticable than it evidently is. Inter-marriage between them would deteriorate the superior variety without a compensating elevation of the inferior. The mulatto, if in some respects superior to the full-blooded negro, is, as a rule, in all respects inferior to the full-blooded white man. In all countries where the mingling of the two races has gone on to any considerable extent, we find a great deterioration in the white race, as may be seen in Spanish and Portuguese America. A marked deterioration would result in our Southern society, were inter-marriages between them to become frequent. But excluding amalgamation, as, to most Americans at least, and especially to the non-slaveholding whites of the South, a thing too shocking to be quietly named, we can see only degradation and oppression for the black race so long as it inhabits the same territory with the white. They can never take their place as equal members in free-white American society; never form with free-white Americans one people; and as they are now in most, and soon would be, in all of the States, the minority, poor and uneducated, they would be not only a distinct, but an inferior people, and consequently an impassable barrier to the realization of that idea of right and equality, in contradistinction from mediæval privilege and inequality, on which our American order of civilization is founded.

We do not in this deny the negro to be a man. We recognize distinctly his manhood: we assert for him all the rights of man; and maintain for him all the civil and political rights we claim for ourselves, only not in one and the same civil and political society with white men, because so great is the interval between him and us, that he cannot enjoy the same political and civil rights except in a society of his own, where color will be no badge of an inferior caste. It is not that we ask less for the negro than the Abolitionists do, but that we ask more for him, and at the same time pay more attention to the tastes, habits, inclinations, and interests of free white American society. We recognize with the Abolitionists the original brotherhood of the human race, but we do not recognize the present equality of the black and white varieties, or admit that the two can

form in the present stage of their respective development society together. For the benefit of each, we wish them to live in free and independent separate communities.

We cannot admit that the Government in denying to the liberated slave the right to pursue his happiness where he pleases, necessarily infringes his liberty. No one has the right in all cases to pursue his own happiness where he pleases. No one can do it by living against my will on my farm, in my house, in my family, or by eating at my table. Every man's right is necessarily limited by every other man's right. The negro's right to live in free white society is limited by the right of free white society to exclude persons, not born in it, whom its members do not wish to associate with. Nor can we admit that the functions of government are merely negative, and that it can never take in any thing the initiative, and act as a positive providence. We are no admirers of the *paternal* governments of Europe, administered on the principle, "All for the people, nothing by the people;" we defend the largest individual liberty compatible with social order and social well-being; but individualism may be carried to a fatal extreme, so as to exclude all government, or so as to convert what is called government into a machine to be worked by individuals for their own private benefit, as was rapidly becoming the case with us before the breaking out of the present civil war. The Government has positive as well as negative functions, and may even restrain a man's freedom for his own benefit. It may found at the public expense, institutions of learning, universities, colleges, seminaries; it may encourage science and art, this or that special industry for the national independence or prosperity; it may found hospitals and asylums, and establish bureaus of beneficence. It may act, and should act as a general social providence. As the social providence it is the natural guardian of the weak and the friendless. It may, then, without assuming any illegitimate power or violating any individual freedom take the guardianship of the emancipated negro slaves, and exercise over them the control necessary to place them in a condition where their freedom can be practically secured, and their rights and interest protected. On this score we have no scruples, and believe the Government might forcibly remove them from its territory to another where they could be better off in a community by themselves, if it saw proper to do so.

But we wish it distinctly understood that we propose no resort to force, and therefore nothing that can be called *deportation*. We rely on voluntary emigration to effect the end we have in view, and to voluntary emigration no abolitionist can object. We want no forced emigration. We demand, first of all, the clear, distinct, and unconditional recognition of the negroes as persons entitled to freedom. We demand this immediately. Slavery everywhere in the United States must be outlawed. We demand this as a political necessity, and as an act of justice to the negro race. Slavery must cease. On this point we are, and, God helping us, will be, abolitionists so long as there is a single slave to be liberated.

Heretofore we have demanded the recognition of the slaves as free persons, on the ground of military necessity. Some pretend, since our late victories, that the plea of military necessity can no longer be urged. We do not concede it. The war is not yet ended. We have gained some important advantages over the rebels; but, if they have any of the characteristic pluck of the stock from which they have sprung, they will not acknowledge themselves beaten, and are not yet beaten, and will give us some hard fighting yet. We cannot say what a few weeks may bring forth, but at the time we are writing, the early part of March, the shouts of victory appear to us to be premature, and it is not impossible that we shall still find it, in order to secure a complete and final triumph, necessary to deprive the rebels of their slaves, and use the services of these slaves in such way as they can best contribute to the defence of the national integrity and life. But be this as it may; if events have weakened the plea of *military* necessity, they have strengthened the plea of *political* necessity. The total cessation of slavery in the United States is a political necessity. It is absolutely necessary to create union and harmony, to mould the people of the North and the people of the South into one homogeneous people, to consolidate and strengthen the nation, to develop its resources, to provide for the general defence, and to enable the American people to work out the great social and political problem committed to them by Providence for solution. It is, happily, a political necessity to which we can yield without violating any private rights, or disturbing any vested interests. Slavery in the adhering Border States can present no difficulty, when it is once abolished in the seceding States, and in the seceding

States it has now no longer any constitutional rights or legal existence in the way of Federal action. It existed there only by local law, and the local law, as we have shown in the foregoing article, has lost its force there; for State rebellion is State suicide. We can therefore yield to political necessity, without compromising private rights or private interests. The whole question of slavery in seceded States is now within the jurisdiction of the United States. The plea of justice to the slave, like the Irishman's plea, Justice to Ireland, always stands good, and never to be disregarded by statesmen, any more than by moralists. On each and all these grounds we demand the total extinction of slavery, and the recognition of all persons heretofore held to service in the seceded States by the laws thereof, as free persons, and as no longer held to service anywhere.

This is the first question, and with this question it would have been well to stop till after the war, and not have inopportunely complicated it with the question, What shall be done with the emancipated slaves? But this latter question has been raised, and we cannot now refuse to consider it, for on its solution depends in no small degree the practical answer that will be given to the question of emancipation itself. We are disposed to agree with President Lincoln, Postmaster-General Blair, and many distinguished Members of both Houses of Congress, that the best mode of dealing with the emancipated slaves is to colonize them outside of the United States, at the earliest reasonable moment. We do not for ourselves, however, make emancipation turn on colonization. We insist on emancipation for its own sake, colonization, or no colonization. We hold that the Government, as the necessary and natural guardian of the emancipated slaves, has the right to insist on their emigration, and that emigration and colonization after emancipation is best for both blacks and whites; but we are persuaded if Government will secure a territory suitable to their tastes, habits, and temperament, and facilitate their migration to it, the emancipated negroes will in a reasonable time, nearly all migrate to it of their own accord. We know the strong local attachment of the negro, and his little enterprising or adventurous disposition, but it must be borne in mind that the negroes have leaders of their own race, or with some mixture of white blood perhaps, who are men of ability, intelligence, and enterprise. These men can be nobody in a community where the white race predom-

inates, and therefore can easily be induced to emigrate and to lead their people with them. Many of these, wearing their life out in slavery, are not wholly unfitted by their genius and ability to lead forth the millions of their race to a new territory, and to found there and govern a state. Seeing that they and their people, if they remain in the United States, must remain there, in spite of all philanthropy can do, as slaves or as outcasts, pariahs, as we have said, they will feel for themselves, and without much difficulty make their people feel, that the best thing for them is to migrate to a country where they can live in a community of their own race, or where at least their own will be the dominant race. Such migration or exode will be the beginning of the uprising of their race. It will quicken a new spirit in them, and be the commencement of their return toward the type from which they have departed so far, and their recompense for the long ages of slavery and oppression they have endured from the white race.

Still we do not conceal from ourselves, the opposition of the other class mentioned at the North, not merely to colonization, but to emancipation under any form or on any condition, is the most formidable obstacle to justice to the slave to be encountered. We have been surprised to find how completely wedded to negro-slavery have become our old Democratic politicians, and how widely pro-slavery sentiments are cherished in the Free States. We had so long been living out of the political world, engrossed with our theological and philosophical studies, that we had taken little note of the changes in public opinion favorable to slavery, which had been effected during the last ten or fifteen years, and we find, very much to our regret, the North, as a whole, less abolition than the South. Our commercial cities had become almost completely Southernized in their views of slavery, and opposition to the existence of slavery, or even to its extension into new territory, has had very little influence with the merchants of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, and the interests of trade, far more than patriotism or loyalty, has moved them to support the Administration in suppressing the Rebellion. The Morrill tariff moved them more than the fall of Sumter. The commercial class in no country and in no age is remarkable for patriotism, and finds usually its country where its profits are largest, or best secured. It with us seeks to preserve the integrity of the Union, for if that should be

lost, they would lose a large portion of their trade. But for the same reason they are opposed to the abolition of slavery. The abolition of slavery, and the great changes it would effect in Southern society, would, at least for a time, seriously lessen the amount of business, and diminish its profits. They want the Union restored as speedily as possible, but at the same time they want slavery retained, so that buying and selling may go on as before, and hence as soon as they thought it likely that slavery might be interfered with, and their old customers at the South crippled in their resources, they became less willing to furnish the government with the means of carrying on the war.

But the politicians, to some extent, of all parties, but more especially of the old Democratic party, are the most inveterate enemies of the policy of emancipation, and from them we hear it proclaimed, over and over again, that the armies of the Union will throw down their arms, if the war were made, in any sense, a war of liberation. They keep up a continued howl against Abolitionists and Radicals, and would seem to regard slavery as more than the Union, as the corner-stone of the Republic, as the essential condition of its prosperity, and the very palladium of its safety. Remove slavery, and we should be obliged to sing, in our grief,

Ilum fuit.

These politicians had for some time a great advantage over us, in making it appear that they had the administration on their side, and that we, in opposing them, were deserting the very president we had helped to elect. Since the sixth of March last, this pretence has been taken from them, and the President, by his message to Congress on that day, shows that the administration is at least on the side of emancipation, and is prepared to initiate it, if, indeed, it be not prepared to go farther.

But the reason of the advocacy of slavery by those old politicians is no secret. If slavery goes, they lose their stock in trade, and their vocation is gone. The Democratic party was always a Southern party. It had its chief strength in the South, and its ablest and most important allies. Let slavery go, and that party is defunct. It can no longer rule the nation, and be henceforth remembered only as the party that, under the pretence of fidelity to the Constitution, has done its best to sacrifice the life of the nation. If slavery be abolished, it can never have the

South with it again. If the Union ceases to be the union of freedom and slavery, it can have no charms for it; for no class of people, than those who composed it, will be more utterly distrusted and despised by the South. They will, therefore, do all in their power to save the "patriarchal institution," and to rear once more their democracy on the slavery of the negro race, as its basis. But we trust they will fail, and the logic of the movement, represented by the Republican party, will carry the nation on, we had almost said, in spite of itself, to the final emancipation of itself from the political power of slavery, by the complete destruction of slavery as property. We think we have shown how this end can be obtained under the Constitution, without violating any Constitutional provision or existing law. If we have so done, the way is clear for the final obliteration from our soil of the curse of slavery.

ART. V.—*Protestantism and Infidelity: an Appeal to candid Americans*. By F. X. WENINGER, D. D., Missionary of the Society of Jesus. New York; Sadlier & Co. 1862. 16mo. pp. 329.

FATHER WENINGER, the distinguished Jesuit Missionary to the Germans, is, we believe, an Austrian by birth, and from a family of some note in his own country. He is a man of large views, and a warm heart, great ability, indomitable energy, and untiring zeal,—the very model of a Missionary. His whole soul appears to be in his work, and he seems to live only for his Master's glory in the salvation of souls. There is no counting the good he has done and is doing, a good the vast extent of which we shall never know till the final judgment. Not contented with travelling day and night, and preaching three or four times a day, and writing and publishing catechetical and other works in his own language, for the instruction or edification of our German population, he devotes no little time to preaching and preparing works in the English language, for the benefit of our English-speaking world, Catholic and non-Catholic. Some months ago, he published an excellent *Manual or Doctrinal Catechism*, admirably adapted to the wants of Catholics in this country, and now in the work before us he makes a direct appeal to our non-Catholic countrymen,

earnestly calling upon them to examine seriously the unhappy and destructive character of their heterodoxy.

The work is designed for popular reading, and is written in a clear, affectionate, popular style, adapted to the apprehension of readers of ordinary capacity and intelligence, but is written with ability, with adequate knowledge of the topics it treats, and cannot fail to interest and command the respect of all classes of readers, however enlightened or cultivated. It is addressed to our heterodox and unbelieving countrymen, as is indicated by its title, *Protestantism and Infidelity*; and we are pleased to see that it does not treat them either as totally destitute of Christian knowledge, or even Christian feelings. The heterodox are not Catholics, but they in some sense pertain to the Christian world and to the Church. They hold not the truth in its unity and catholicity; yet they hold more or less of it, and, for the most part, the same moral and spiritual appeals to conscience which move the Catholic move them, and even those among them who fancy they do not even believe in Christianity. There are great differences between them and us, but the points of resemblance are more numerous, and more important. Let a Catholic preach to a congregation of non-Catholics, very much as he would preach to a congregation of Catholics, in whom he wished to awaken a sense of the importance and necessity of religion as the condition of their salvation and sanctity, and they will listen to him as respectfully as would his Catholic auditory, and be moved by his preaching very much as they would be. Reason is the same, and the law of conscience is the same in both. This important fact Father Weninger fully recognizes, and adopts it as the law of his proceeding.

The author, though he has served principally as a missionary to an old Catholic people settled in the country, has, by his varied intercourse with non-Catholic Americans come to believe their conversion to the Catholic Church is not only possible, but comparatively easy, if missions were opened to them, and serious and earnest efforts were made to present them that faith in its simplicity, freed from those associations which have hitherto repelled rather than attracted them to it. He has learned to like the American people, and he believes that they only need to join the Catholic faith and worship to their order of civilization, to be the greatest and noblest people on earth. Nothing more grieves his heart than the very general neglect to open missions to

them, directly to recall them to unity and Catholicity. He cannot bear to look, under a Catholic point of view, on their spiritual destitution, and he leaves no stone unturned to induce the proper authorities to direct attention to their wants, and, instead of pushing them aside as heterodox and infidel, to send them missionaries who will present them the Church in her true and proper character. He judges the American people rightly, and does them no more than simple justice. In their order of civilization they are already the most catholic people on earth, and there are no people better predisposed to accept and conform to Catholic truth in religion than they are, when once it is presented to them, and so presented that they see that it is catholic and not simply sectarian.

The Catholic religion has never yet been rejected by the American people, for it has never yet been presented to them. What they regard as the Catholic religion is not that religion itself, but its accidents, or certain things that it has gathered around it in its passage through various nations and ages, and which not only they, but many Catholics themselves, confound with it. These things they reject, and are quite right in doing so, but, in rejecting them, they reject nothing catholic, for catholicity is only that which is believed everywhere and always, by all the faithful. What pertains to this or that age or nation, participates of time and place, is local and temporary in its character, and not catholic, and is no essential part of catholic truth, even when not repugnant to it. What the American people want is not the religion of Irishmen, Englishmen, or Germans, or the Catholic religion as these have developed, explained, modified or overlaid it, but the simple catholic truth which subsists in all ages and nations, and does and will outlive all the mutations of time and space. This and this alone is Catholic truth, this and this alone is Catholic religion, and this and this alone is what is necessary to present to the American people, and what has as yet never been distinctly presented to them. But this, they who are simply missionaries to the old Catholic people, do not present pure and simple; far less is it presented by an old Catholic laity from old and foreign Catholic countries. These always think the Gentile converts must be circumcised, and observe the Jewish law, and need a St. Paul to preach to them that the works of the law avail nothing, and to make known to them the freedom we have in Christ.

They who are especially missionaries to the Gentiles are the first to get rid of Judaism, and to understand that the observance of the Jewish law is no essential part of Christianity.

Every man has, if a living man, his special vocation, and they who are specially appointed to labor for a people already Catholic, are seldom those who can labor with the most zeal and success for the conversion of the heterodox and unbelievers. Indeed, in our country, the Bishops and Parish Priests could not specially devote themselves to those outside of the Catholic communion, however ardently they might desire to do so. They have no time to spare for that purpose. They must, first of all, attend to the spiritual wants of the faithful who have been committed to their charge, and this engrosses all their time and energy. Even Protestants do not rely on their "settled" ministry to bring us Catholics into their various sects, and send out missionaries supposed, but often erroneously supposed, to be specially adapted to the work of converting Romanists, who make that their special vocation. Now, every Catholic holds his Church to be the only true Catholic Church, holding and teaching the only true Catholic faith, without which no man is joined to Christ as his head, or is in the way of salvation, "for there is no other name than that of Jesus Christ given under Heaven among men whereby we can be saved." Every Catholic, then, must desire, in proportion to his charity, to convert all unbelievers and misbelievers, and to bring all men into the Church, and into union with Him who died to redeem us, and lives to save us, and glorify us in Heaven. He who should not so desire would be a bad Catholic, and prove that he lacked Christian charity, without which knowledge and faith, miracles and alms-deeds can avail one nothing. He is not to be branded as a zealot or a bigot because he burns with the ardent desire to make all men Catholics. His desire is the natural desire of every Catholic, and only proves the earnestness and sincerity of his faith, and his consistency as a man. This conduct can give no offence to those who are not of his religion, so long as he seeks their conversion only by fair and honorable means, only by arguments addressed to intelligence and the moral affections. The Catholic Church, if a living Church, must be progressive, and progressive by propagandism. This is a proof not of her illiberality, bigotry, and exclusiveness, but of her life, vigor, and love. Catholics in this country must desire and feel them-

selves bound to labor in the most practicable way for the conversion of the country, if they have any faith or confidence in their own religion. They must not merely rejoice when the stray sheep returns to the fold, but they must leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness who went not astray, and go forth into the mountains to seek and find the one sheep that was lost. The Son of Man came to seek and to save; he did not wait till he was sought, or give command to let the stray sheep go, and merely take care that no more go astray; and Christ is the Good Shepherd, and the model of the good pastor.

Nothing in fact produces a more unfavorable impression upon non-Catholics than the apparent indifference of our bishops and priests to their conversion, and their apparent earnestness only in guarding the remnants of the flock that remain. This guarding of the faithful should, of course, be attended to, but the conversion of unbelievers should not be neglected. The Good Shepherd commits to them the care of all his sheep; but all his sheep are not already in the fold. "Other sheep have I, not of this fold; them also must I bring in, that there may be one fold and one shepherd." These other sheep not in the fold must not be neglected, and when they whose business is to bring them in, only sit still and wait for them to come in, or only open the door and let them come in when they knock at it and beg for admission, are not faithful shepherds, and neither follow the example nor obey the injunctions of their Master. This lack of fidelity, of earnestness, and zeal, begets in the minds of non-Catholics a distrust of their faith, and that in turn begets a distrust of the value of the religion they profess. Those outside are frequently edified by the strong attachment manifested by simple faithful Catholics to the Church for themselves, but they would be led to esteem the Church more, if they saw her children equally attached to her for the sake of others.

If the Church is to live and take root in this country, she must prove that she has in her the vital energy of propagandism, and she must advance and extend herself by conversions, not by mere natural increase. As the bishops and priests charged with the care of the faithful population cannot personally attend to it, Father Weninger's plan of opening missions directly to the non-Catholic American people seems to us an excellent one, and deserving of all encouragement. Missionaries devoted especially to the

work of converting the American people, and having their heart in the work, whether native-born or foreign-born, will study the American institutions and character, learn the peculiarly American mind, ascertain its real disposition and wants, and present the Catholic truth in its purity and simplicity, stripped of all that is foreign or not necessary to it, that may have been associated with it by old Catholics. They will be embarrassed by none of the prejudices, habits, customs, and, we may say, superstitions of a foreign population, and, if we know any thing of our countrymen, they will meet with ample success, even though they should be men of no remarkable genius, ability, learning, or eloquence. Twelve fishermen from the Lake of Gensareth converted the world, and twelve honest, simple-minded, earnest, and faithful men can do it again, for they can have the same truth, the same Lord Jesus Christ as the medium of their power, and the same Holy Ghost to give them heroism and victory. The truth is as living and as present, the Word made flesh is as near, and the Holy Ghost as strong and as loving to-day, as on the day of Pentecost. Men only have changed.

We hope, then, we shall not be thought to go out of the proper sphere of a layman, if we second what we know to be Father Weninger's wishes, and respectfully urge upon the proper authorities the opening in some way of American missions, and the setting on foot of the measures necessary, we say not to convert, but to give the American people a fair opportunity of becoming converted if they choose. The time was never more favorable than now. The calamities of civil war, the distress in many parts of the country, and the manifest failure of many of our plans and hopes, have disposed the great body of the American people to thoughtfulness, shaken their confidence in most of the radicalisms in religion, politics, and morals, so rife a few years ago, made them more ready to listen to the wisdom of past ages, and to be told that the true future must have its root in what has been, and be simply its evolution or development. And although Catholics have not done what they might, and should have done, to prove their sympathy with constitutional freedom and their loyalty to the United States, yet the readiness with which large numbers of them have volunteered to fight the battles of the country, and to aid in saving the life and integrity of the nation, has removed many prejudices from the minds of non-Catholic Americans, and rendered them less unwilling

to listen to the claims of our Church. They see and feel the necessity of a stronger conservative element than we have hitherto had, and an element, not like that of slavery repugnant to freedom, but a conservative element, which, while it favors order and stability, favors also the free development of thought, the evolution of truth, and the real and continuous progress of civilization; and we go not too far when we say many of them are beginning to ask themselves if this element may not, after all, be found in the old Catholic Church, presented in her purity and catholicity. Never has there been, and, if neglected, never will there be, at least for a long time to come, so favorable an opportunity for gaining a respectful hearing in this country for our religion.

In the work of presenting the Catholic cause to the favorable notice of those alien from our communion, we have few works popular in their character superior to this little volume, written out from the very heart and soul of its author, on "Protestantism and Infidelity." It should be distributed broadcast by the missionaries among non-Catholics, and though it will not take root in all of them, it will take root in some hearts, spring up, and bear fruit, it may be an hundred fold. We will not say that, in our judgment, it is the best book of the sort that could be written, but it is a good book, and should go along with the *Questions of the Soul* and the *Aspirations of Nature*, by Father Hecker, and the excellent volume of sermons recently published by the Paulists. The author begins by endeavoring to prove, in a clear and affectionate manner, that Protestantism is a Religion of Despair, because it fails to meet the wants and necessities of the human soul, and because it leads to Infidelity, which is only another name for despair itself, since it is the grave of faith and hope. Having arrived at this conclusion, he proceeds to present the Catholic religion as the religion of faith, hope, and love, to explain briefly its dogmas and sacraments, and to refute in few words the more frequent objections urged against them. The two parts of the book make together an excellent tract on the deficiencies and dangers of Protestantism, and the truth, completeness, excellence, and desirableness of the Catholic religion.

With regard to the position that Protestantism leads to Infidelity, understanding by the term *infidelity* the total rejection of the Christian religion as a revelation of the super-

intelligible, we remark that Protestantism is heterodox, and all heterodoxy holds truth, but not in its unity and catholicity. All truth is in its own nature one and catholic, and heterodoxy or error is not so much the total denial of all truth, as it is the failure to recognize and hold truth in its real and proper relations. It mutilates truth, and misplaces the truth it retains. As all truth is one and catholic, that is, one and universal truth, any error against it taken by itself, or as the logical point of departure, necessarily involves the denial of all truth, or the reversal of the whole order of truth. In this sense, if you take Protestantism on the side of its error, and complete it negatively, it leads necessarily to infidelity, or pure negation; while, on the other hand, if you take it on the side of the truth it retains, and complete it in a positive or affirmative sense, it leads to the one and catholic truth held by the Church and evolved in her life.

But while we say this, we must not forget that if in Protestant countries there are infidels who may trace their infidelity to Protestantism, there are also infidels in Catholic countries in nearly equal numbers, who have not derived their infidelity from that source. There are, in proportion to the population, very nearly as many unbelievers in Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, and Spanish and Portuguese America, as in Protestant Germany, Great Britain, and the United States. These unbelievers in Catholic countries have not been made so by Protestantism. We cannot deny their existence, and it would be unjust to make Protestantism responsible for their unbelief. Protestantism, by making the authority in revealed truth a dead Book, leads to infidelity, because the Book, having no living interpreter, necessarily confines those who rely on it alone to a dead past, and permits no continuous or living evolution of truth, to meet the ever-varying wants of human science and human culture. Catholics would favor the same result, if, in transferring the authority from the Book to the Church, they transferred it to a dead and not a living Church. It is not authority that is objected to on either side, for all know that as religion has its root and life in the superintelligible, it must depend on supernatural revelation, which can be received by the human mind only by faith, therefore only by authority. Everybody knows, also, that the revelation, when made, is and must be authoritative. Protestantism does not lead to infidelity, because it denies authority and asserts private

judgment, for it, as well as Catholicity, asserts authority, and Catholics must assert private judgment in understanding the words of the Church, as well as Protestants in interpreting the words of Scripture. In principle, on both of these points Catholics and Protestants are agreed, and both are catholic, for the principle of authority is alike asserted whether, in point of fact, you place authority in the Church or in the Book; and the liberty of private interpretation is alike asserted in principle when allowed as to the words of either.

The principle that leads to unbelief is neither the principle of authority nor the principle of private examination, or interpretation. All who recognize belief at all, as distinguished from science, admit the principle of authority; and all who recognize belief as an intellectual act, do, and must admit the principle of private judgment, for we must attach some meaning to the words we believe, and the meaning we attach is our private judgment of their sense. What leads to infidelity in most cases where it exists, is the assertion of *the authority of the past in a sense to interdict the future*, so as to prohibit the future continuous explication and application of the Christian Idea the Church is realizing, and to bind the believer back to a dead past. The Reformers did this when they denied the living authority of the Church, and transferred authority to the words of a Book, for the Book is of the past, not of the present, a dead, not a living Book. Their doctrine strictly adhered to would have interdicted the whole future. The founders of the Anglican establishment practically did the same, for though they did not absolutely or formally deny the authority of the Church, they denied her to be catholic in time, by binding her back to the first four General Councils, and to the words of a dead book. They bound her to the past, and interdicted the evolution of the future. The Catholic Church in herself can do no such thing, because she is Catholic in time as well as space, is an ever-present living Church, living by the indwelling presence of the Word made flesh, and the continuous evolution, explication, and application of her Divine-human or Theandric Idea. But Catholics who are orthodox as to the letter of the dogma, may and often do fall into an error of precisely the same sort, and transfer the authority which belongs only to the living, ever-present Church to the past Church, and making the authority of the past interdict the liberty of the present and the future. This, we apprehend, is the chief cause of unbelief in Ca-





